THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL NEW DELHI

O.A. No.	501	198
T.A. No.		

	DATE OF DECISION
···	Petitioner
	Advocate for the Petitionerts)
	Versus
	Respondent
	Advocate for the Respondent(s)
CORAM :	i'ce chairman
CORAW	Tope adribe,
The Hon'ble Mr.	B. N. Jappagambe, vice chairman Pero penser ()
The Hon'ble Mr.	D. Surge
	The state of Level memory may be ellowed to see the Judgement?

- Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judge
- To be referred to the Reporter or not?
- Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? No 3.
- Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? MGIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000



IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERA BAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.501 of 1987.

Date of Order : 16-10-1989.

P.V.Rama Narsaiah

...Applicant

Versus

The Post Master General, Andhra Pradesh Circle, Hyderabad and 2 others.

....Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri K.S.R.Anjaneyulu

Counsel for the Respondents: Shri J.Ashok Kumar

COR AM:

HONOURABLE SHRI B.N.JAYASIMHA: VICE-CHAIRMAN
HONOURABLE SHRI D'SURYA RAO : MEMBER (J)(I)

(Judgment of the Bench dicted by Hon'ble
Shri B.N.Jayasimha, Vice-Chairman)

The applicant who is working as an Inspector of of Post Offices has filed this application against his non-promotion as Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices.

The applicant contends that the promotion to the post of Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices is on the basis of seniority cum fitness. Despite his having good record of service he has not been considered for promotion and thus he has been superseded. Certain adverse entries were made by the reporting officer in 1984 and 1985 and they are not valid. He was also awarded the punishment of with holding one increment for one year. This punishment ment was not valid as the period of absense was later

contd...2:

Τo

- The Post Master General, Andhra Pradesh Circle, Hyderabad.
- The Director of Post Services, Eastern Region, Vijayawada.
- 3. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Khammam.
- 4. One copy to Mr. K.S.R.Anjaneyulu, Advocate 1-1-365, Jawaharnagar, Bakaram, Hyderabad-20.
- 5. One copy to Mr.J.Ashok Kumar, S.C. for Postal Dept., Hyderabad.
- 6. One spare copy.

Dir.

The Way

treated as duty as he was seriously ill. He was also allowed to cross efficiency bar. He therefore contends that his non promotion is illegal.

- 2. A counter has been filed by the respondents denying the contentions raised by the applicant.
- 3. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant Shri Anjaneyulu and the learned standing counsel for the department Shri Ashok Kumar, who has produced the relevant records. We find from the records that the Departmental Promotion Committee has considered the applicant along with others and came to the conclusion that he does not deserve to be promoted on the basis of his record as reflected in the Confidential Reports. Since the D.P.C. has considered the record of service of the applicant and found him not fit for promotion, we do not find any merit in the contentions urged by the applicant. The application is accordingly dismissed.

by Jaynuh (B.N. JAYASIMHA) Vice-Chairman

(D.SURYA RAO) Member (J)(I)

Dt. 16th October, 1989. Dictated in Open Court.

Deputs Osison (A)

AVL.