

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE.

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF DECEMBER, 1986.  
PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, .. Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr. L.H.A. Rego, .. Member(A).

APPLICATION NUMBER 1710 OF 1986.

Smt. Usha V. Nitsure,  
LSG, SPM Sainik School S.C.  
Bijapur-586 101.

.. Applicant.

v.

1. The Director General (Postal),  
New Delhi.
2. The Post Master General  
in Karnataka, Bangalore.
3. The Director of Postal Services,  
North Karnataka Region, Dharwad.
4. The Senior Superintendent of  
Post Offices, Bijapur  
Division, Bijapur.

.. Respondents.

(By Sri M. Vasudev Rao, Standing Counsel)

--

This application coming on for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

Case called.

2. Smt. Usha V. Nitsure, applicant who is present has argued the case. Hence the learned counsel for the applicant who is also present did not rightly argue the case.

3. In this application made under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act') the applicant has challenged Order No. 8A-3/4/LSG PAS/86 dated 14-4-1986 of the Superintendent of Post Offices, Bijapur Division, Bijapur ('Superintendent') in so far as the said order, transfers her from the office of the Sub-Post Master,

Sainik School, Bijapur to the office of the Sub-Post Office, Madhebihal Bazar.

4. The applicant has challenged the order of the Superintendent principally on the ground that the same causes her and her children who are studying in the Sainik Primary School, Bijapur, serious inconvenience and hardship.

5. On 23-9-1986 a Division Bench of this Tribunal consisting one of us (Sri L.H.A. Rego, Member) and Hon'ble Member Sri Ch. Ramakrishna Rao, had ordered notices to the respondents before admission to which they had filed their reply asserting that the transfer was made on administrative grounds or in public interest in general transfers in April, 1986 and there were no grounds to interfere with the same.

6. The applicant has filed a rejoinder to-day running to 12 pages with 5 annexures to the reply of the respondents, in which she has alleged that the transfer was actuated by bias or malice of Sri B.S. Ratnakar, who was then the Superintendent that made her transfer which she sought to highlight at length. But, we did not permit the applicant to urge the plea of mala fides belatedly alleged in her rejoinder filed to-day without the permission of this Tribunal. We, therefore decline to examine the plea of mala fides alleged by the applicant against the Superintendent.

7. We find that the transfer of the applicant has been made by the Superintendent on administrative grounds or in the public interest in the general transfers and not on any collateral considerations and grounds. Every transfer causes some inconvenience to a civil servant. But, that is hardly a ground for this Tribunal to interfere with a transfer made on administrative grounds or in the public interest. We see no merit in any of the contentions urged by the applicant