

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

Original Application No: 620/94

Date of Decision: 1.7.1999

Shri Anantao Waman Gaikwad

Applicant.

Shri S.P.Kulkarni.

Advocate for
Applicant.

Versus

Union of India and others.

Respondent(s)

Shri S.S.Karkera for
Shri P.M.Pradhan.

Advocate for
Respondent(s)

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri. Justice S. Venkataraman, Vice Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri. S.K. Ghosal, Member(A)

- (1) To be referred to the Reporter or not?
- (2) Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?


(S.Venkataraman)
Vice Chairman

NS

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH 'GULESTAN' BUILDING NO:6
PRESCOT ROAD, MUMBAI:1

Original Application No. 620/94

Thursday the 1st day of July 1999.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.Venkataraman, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri S.K. Ghosal, Member(A)

Anantrao Waman Gaikwad
Residing at
97-B, Naateshwar Housing Society
Behind Cotton Market, P.O. Dhule.
Dist Dhule.

... Applicant.

By Advocate Shri S.P.Kulkarni.

V/s.

1. Union of India through
Postmaster General
Aurangabad Region,
At P.O. Aurangabad
District - Aurangabad.
2. Senior Superintendent of
Post Offices,
Dhule Postal Division
P.O. Dhule.
3. Chief Postmaster General
Maharashtra Circle,
Old Bldg.,
Near V.T. Fort,
Bombay.
4. Shri M.P. Saudagar
Postmaster Latur (OSD)

... Respondents.

By Advocate Shri S.S.Karkera for Shri P.M.Pradhan.

ORDER (ORAL)

¶ Per Shri Justice S.Venkataraman, Vice Chairman¶

The applicant who joined the service as
Postal Clerk was selected to lower Selection Grade
in the year 1977-78. He was appointed on 8.4.1981.
when L.S.G. Cadre ^{gradation} list was published, In 1993 his
name had been omitted. ^{Apper} Further he gave a representation
and his name was included by memorandum dated 24.4.1991.

The respondents was informed that his claim for HSG II would be considered. The applicant's grievance is that his juniors was promoted to HSG II in February 1989. ~~Though~~ ^{but} the respondents informed him that his name was considered by the D.P.C. ^{but} they did not select him. He questioned the selection by giving representation and there was no response on the part of the respondents. He ~~demands~~ ^{Concedes} that he suffered the penalty of stoppage of increment by three months on 1.2.1986. In this application he has sought for a ~~direction to peruse~~ ^{quashing} the DPC proceedings ^{of July 91} and ~~sought other~~ consequential benefits. ^{and a direction to hold review DPC and from the time with}

2. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that no review D.P.C. has been held as required. But the respondents have produced the records to show that the D.P.C. has considered the case of the applicant for the vacancy in 1989. We have perused those records and we find that the applicant's case has been considered for the vacancy of 1989 for the post of HSG II and the Committee did not find him suitable for promotion to HSG II. We do not find any infirmity in the DPC proceedings. In the circumstances the application is rejected. No costs.


(S.K. Ghosal)
Member (A)


(S. Venkataraman)
Vice Chairman