

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE ELEVENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1987

Present : Hon'ble Shri Ch. Ramakrishna Rao Member (J)
Hon'ble Shri L.H.A. Rego Member (AM)

APPLICATION NO. 1694/86(T)

Shri C.V. Appu,
residing at 10/6, Venkatraman Layout,
Maruthi Sevanagar, Bangalore - 560 033.

...

APPLICANT

vs.

1. The Union of India
represented by the Secretary
to Government, Ministry of
Railways, Rail Bhavan,
New Delhi.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Southern Railway, Bangalore
Divisional Offices,
Bangalore - 560 023.
3. The General Manager (Personnel),
Southern Railway Zonal H.Q.
Offices, Park Town,
Madras - 600 003.

(SHRI M. SREERANGIAH ... ADVOCATE)

4. V. Mehanraj,
T.I.O./YPR.
5. K. Nagabhuhanam,
SM/GBD.
6. M. Chinnathambi,
EE 836.
7. P. Krishnamurthy,
RT 3384.
8. R. Christopher,
EE 1655
9. D. Kesavam,
Offg. Dy. SS/SBC.
10. C. Krishnaswamy,
EMT 2284.
11. D. Thiagarajan.
12. K. Jayapal,
TIO, Bangarpet.

... RESPONDENTS

(Nos. 4 to 11 & The Divisional Manager,
Bangalore City, through
DPR, Bangalore.)

This application has come up before the court today.

Hon'ble Shri L.H.A. Rego, Member(AM) made the following :

O R D E R

Applicant in person. Shri M.Sreerangaiah, Counsel for Railways present, for Respondents 1 to 3.

2. The applicant states that he had submitted a representation dated 10.3.1985 to the Divisional Personnel Officer, SBC, Bangalore(DPO), pointing out that the quota reserved in the grades of Rs.550-750 and Rs.700-900 for the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe candidates was exceeded, depriving thereby legitimate opportunity to him for promotion to these grades. He further states that he had submitted another representation ^{de to} _{1 1} to the Divisional Railway Manager, Bangalore (DRM) thereafter, but both these representations have remained unanswered.

3. We, therefore, direct the DPO/DRM to examine the above representations of the applicant and give a reply to him within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order. If the applicant is still aggrieved, he may approach this Tribunal only after exhausting all channels of redressal available to him in his department.

4. We regret to note that the Respondents have taken inordinately long to dispose of the above representations of the applicant, which does not conduce to administrative justice. At least an interim reply should have been given to the representation of the applicant, to let him know the factual position. His representation should now be disposed of within the time-limit stipulated above.