

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore-560 038.

Dated:- 5 AUG 1994

APPLICATION NUMBER:

833/93

APPLICANTS:

Sri. B.R. Manjappa v/s. Chief Post Master General, Karnataka Circle  
T.O. and Others.

RESPONDENTS:

1. Sri. D. Leelakrishnan, Advocate,  
No. 28, Rajendra Building,  
Seshadripuram, Bangalore-560020.
2. Sri. G. Sharathappa,  
Addl. C. G.S.C.  
High Court Rdg, Bangalore-560001.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the  
Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/  
~~STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER~~, passed by this Tribunal in the above  
mentioned application(s) on 27.07.94

of

S. Shannan 5/8  
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
BANGALORE BENCH.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 833/ 1993

WEDNESDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF JULY, 1994

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar ... Vice Chairman

Shri T.V. Ramanan ... Member (A)

Shri B.R. Manjappa,  
Son of Rangappa,  
Aged about 33 years,  
Residing at B D A Quarters,  
Domlur,  
Bangalore - 560 071. ... Applicant

( By Advocate Shri D. Leelakrishnan )

Vs.

1. The Chief Post Master General,  
Karnataka Circle,  
Bangalore-560 001.
2. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Virgonagar,  
Bangalore-560 049.
3. The Asst. Superintendent of Post  
Offices, East Sub-Division-III,  
Bangalore-560 017. ... Respondents

( By Advocate Shri G. Shanthappa, Additional  
Central Government Standing Counsel )

ORDER

Shri T.V. Ramanan, Member (A)

We have heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and  
the learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

2. The case of the applicant is that he was appointed as an  
Extra Departmental Delivery Agent (EDDA) at Domlur Post Office for  
a period of two months from 1.8.92 or until regular arrangement

....2/-



was made to fill up that post. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices concerned had taken action to fill that post on a regular basis for which he had called for names of eligible persons from the Employment Exchange. After receipt of a panel of names which contained the name of the applicant also and after an interview on 14.8.92 the applicant learnt that he had been selected to be appointed to the post on a regular basis but no order of appointment was forthcoming. However, the applicant was allowed to function as EDDA even beyond 30.9.92. On 13.10.93 he came to know from one Shri Balaram of Domlur that the Department had called for a fresh panel of names for the post in question held provisionally by the applicant and that he (Balaram), being one of the candidates sponsored for the post, had been called for interview on 14.10.93. The applicant tried his best to prevail upon R-3 to consider his case also as he had already been interviewed on 14.8.92 for appointment to the post on a regular basis but in vain. Hence this application.

3. The case of the respondents is that because of the residential qualification required for holding this post and the applicant having mentioned that he was residing at C-5/230 'C' Type, Domlur, Bangalore-71 after his initial temporary appointment and before he could be considered for regular appointment, a check was made which

revealed that he was not a resident of Domlur, Bangalore-71 and, therefore, for having given a false residential address in his application, it was decided not to proceed with consideration of the applicant's case for the post but call for a fresh list of candidates from the Employment Exchange which the respondents did on 3.8.93.

4. The argument of the learned counsel for the applicant is that prescription of permanent residential qualification as a condition of eligibility is violative of Article 16 of the Constitution. He cited the judgement of the Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal in the case of P.B. Kochuthresia vs. Superintendent of Post Offices, Aluva and others ( (1993) 24 ATC 59 ) which declared instructions contained in a circular of the Director General, P&T Board prescribing residential qualification for ED staff as precondition to appointment as ED BPM/ SPM ultravires of the provisions referred to above in the Constitution.

5. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondents contends that at the relevant point of time permanent residential qualification as per instructions was a must and that only by a circular letter dated 6.12.93 issued by Director General, Posts this was done away with. Hence non-consideration of the applicant for the post of EODA cannot be disputed.



6. In the case of Kochuthresia the applicant was aggrieved by her non-selection to the post of EDBPM on the ground that she did not satisfy the eligibility condition stipulated for the post of EDBPM by the Director General of P&T in O.M. dated 30.1.81 that the "EDBPM/ EDSPM must be a permanent resident of the village where the post office is located". In that case the Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal considered the constitutionality of that portion of the circular dated 30.1.81 issued by the Director General of P&T which laid down residential qualification for recruitment to the posts of EDBPM. The relevant portion of the said circular read as follows:-

- " (i) The EDBPM/ EDSPM must be a permanent resident of the village where the post office is located. He should be able to attend to the post office work as required of him keeping in view the time of receipt, despatch and delivery of mails which need not be adapted to suit the convenience or his main avocation.
- (ii) ED Mail Carriers, Runners and Mail Peons should reside in the station of the main post office or stage wherefrom mails originate/ terminate, i.e. they should be permanent residents of the delivery jurisdiction of the post office.
- (iii) ED Agents of other categories may, as far as possible, reside in or near the place of their work. (letter No. 5-9/72-El Cell, dated 18.8.1973, and 43-312-78-Pen., dated 20.1.1979, stand modified to this extent). "

The Tribunal held as follows:-

"The nexus between the attributes of the office of EDBPM/ EDSPM and the eligibility criterion of 'permanent' residence in the village where the post office is situated to the exclusion of all other forms of residence or holding of property in that village, is neither reasonable nor valid. Moreover, such a classification of permanent residents of the village having not been approved by the

Parliament and that limited to village only and not to the State as a whole is not saved by Article 16(3) and is, therefore, totally in conflict with Article 16(2) of the Constitution. Even the eligibility criterion of residence in the village would be equally violative of Article 16 (2) of the Constitution.

The eligibility criterion of 'permanent' residence cannot be interpreted to mean 'permanent' residence after selection. One could, though read down the residential qualification as a condition posterior rather than anterior to selection, such a reading down of 'permanent residential qualification' would do violence to natural meaning of 'permanent resident' clearly and unambiguously mentioned in the impugned letter. This is apart from the fact that the doctrine of reading down cannot appropriately be applied to administrative instructions.

Even if 'permanent residence' is read down as a post-selection requirement it will still be violative of Article 19(1) (e) of the Constitution. The impugned circular dated 30.1.1981, to the extent it mandates residence in the village concerned, violates Article 16 of the Constitution. The selection made under the impugned letter requires to be set aside and a fresh selection conducted by replacing the 'permanent' residential condition by a condition of residence simpliciter in the village concerned and that too as a condition to be fulfilled subsequently and not precedent to selection and appointment to the post of EOBPM/ EDSPM. "

7. The post of EDDA, Domlur for which the applicant herein was considered falls under "E.D. Agents of other Categories" as in clause (iii) of that portion of the Director General, P&T's circular reproduced above. The stipulation therein is that EDDAs may, as far as possible, reside in or near the place of their work (emphasis added). While in the case of Kochuthresia, the post involved being EOBPM the permanent residential qualification in the village in which the post office is located was a must, here there is a diluted residential qualification in that for the post of EDDA it was not necessary that the EDDA should be a <sup>permanent</sup> resident of the area covered by the post office concerned but may, as far as possible,



be a resident in or near the place of his work (emphasis added).

There was thus more flexibility in so far as recruitment to the

posts of EDDA was concerned. So, the subsequent finding that

the applicant was not a resident of Domlur would not make any

difference for consideration of the applicant for the post of

EDDA in Domlur Post Office. We fully agree with the view held by

the Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal that the condition of resi-

dence simpliciter should be required to be fulfilled subsequently

and not precedent to selection and appointment. Abiding by this

judgement the circular letter dated 6.12.93 by Director General,

Post clearly states as follows:-

"(ii) The Board also decided that having regard to the judgement of the CAT, it may be clarified that while making selections for appointment to ED posts, permanent residence in the village/ delivery jurisdiction of the ED post office need not be insisted upon as a pre-condition for appointment. However, it should be laid down as a conditions of appointment that any candidates, who is selected must before appointment to the post take up his residence in the village/ delivery jurisdiction of the ED post office as the case may be."

8. We find from the record made available to us by the

department that after having obtained names from the Employment

Exchange, the department had considered the eligible candidates

and had selected the applicant for the post of EDDA, Domlur.

Subsequently, only on the ground that he was not residing at

Domlur but at Krishnarajapuram, both suburbs of Bangalore, an

attempt was made to disqualify him for being considered for that

post. It is absolutely clear from the statement of the applicant given before one Shri Manjunath, Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices on 26.3.1993 that only three months previously he had shifted his residence with his wife to Krishnarajapuram. Learned Counsel for the applicant makes a submission before us that the applicant today lives at C-5/ 230 'C' Type, Domlur, Bangalore-71, although his wife lives at Krishnarajapuram.

9. Apart from the fact that prescription of residential qualification as a pre-requisite for selection as ED Agent has been done away with by the department itself by issue of ~~the~~ circular letter of 6.12.93 making a reference to the judgement of CAT referred to above, the circular making it clear that while making selection for appointment of ED posts permanent residence in the village/ delivery jurisdiction of ED Post Office need <sup>not</sup> <sub>1/4</sub> be insisted upon as a pre-condition for appointment, but a condition should be laid down that after selection the selected person must, before appointment to the post, take up residence in the village/ delivery jurisdiction of the E.D. Post Office. This being the position and no regular appointment order having been issued to the applicant so far despite his selection for the post of EDDA, Domlur, and the submission made that he is now residing at Domlur, overlooking of the candidature of the applicant for appointment as EDDA, Domlur is not tenable.

10. In view of the foregoing, we accept this application, quash the letter dated 3.8.93 calling fresh names from the Employment Exchange and direct the respondents to issue an order of appointment appointing the applicant as EDDA in the Domlur Post Office on a regular basis. This direction may be carried out within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

( T.V. Ramanan )  
Member (A)

Sd/-

( P.K. Shyamsundar )  
Vice Chairman

TRUE COPY

Se Shambu  
SECTION OFFICER 5/8  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE

