

(35)

# Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

O.A. No. 383/89.

T.A.No:-

Date of Decision : 30.7.1991.

Ch. Anjamma

Petitioner.

Shri B. Shanker

Advocate for the  
petitioner (s)

Versus

Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices,

Respondent.

Hyderabad South East Division, & another

Hyderabad-500027 & another

Shri N. Bhaskara Rao,

Advocate for the  
Respondent (s)

Addl. CGSC

**CORAM :**

THE HON'BLE MR. J. Narasimha Murthy : Member (Judl)

THE HON'BLE MR. R. Balasubramanian : Member (Admn)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?
5. Remarks of Vice Chairman on columns 1, 2, 4  
(To be submitted to Hon'ble Vice Chairman where he is not on the Bench)

1/2

HJNM  
M(J)

HRBS  
M(A)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH.  
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A. No. 383/89.

Date of Judgment 30.7.1991.

Ch. Anjamma

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. Sr. Supdt. of  
Post Offices,  
Hyderabad South-  
East Division,  
Hyderabad-500027.

2. Postmaster-General,  
Hyderabad-500001. .. Respondents

---  
Counsel for the Applicant : Shri B. Shanker

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N. Bhaskara Rao,  
Addl. CGSC

---  
CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri J. Narasimha Murthy : Member (Judl)

Hon'ble Shri R. Balasubramanian : Member (Admn)

[ Judgment as per Hon'ble Shri R. Balasubramanian,  
Member (Admn) ]

---  
This application has been filed by Smt. Ch. Anjamma  
under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985  
against the Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Hyderabad South East  
Division, Hyderabad-500027 and another, seeking a direction  
to the respondents that they calculate her workload taking into  
account the work involved in handling Cumulative Time Deposits,  
Recurring Deposits, Registered Letters etc.

2. The applicant is working as EDSPM at APERL Post,  
Hyderabad-500030. It is her grievance that pay scales of  
E.D. postal staff are fixed on the basis of workload measured

in terms of time test applicable to departmental sub offices. When such a measure is adopted in fixing pay scales, an EDSPM's work is calculated at 3 hours per day and that of Messengers at 5 hours per day. She is also aggrieved that prior to August, 1987 she was getting more than a Messenger whereas now after that the Messenger gets more. She has, therefore, prayed that instead of the time test it is workload involving various aspects that should be assessed and the remuneration fixed accordingly.

3. The application is contested by the respondents. The applicant serves in a non-delivery EDSO within the premises of the APERL serving a small clientele. This S.O. is in the delivery jurisdiction of Rajendranagar Delivery S.O. As per the rules on the subject, these E.D. offices function for limited hours not exceeding 5 hours. The workload is assessed in terms of coefficient as is done in respect of departmental offices. The E.D. officials are paid as per the rate prescribed by the Govt. of India with reference to the workload fixed in the above manner. The workload of this office was last verified in November, 1989 only and that too based on the statistics furnished by the applicant herself and verified by the Asst. Supdt. of Post Offices. The workload has accordingly been fixed. It is also contended that there is no comparison between her post and that of the Messenger who is now designated as E.D. Mail Carrier-cum-E.D. Packer. This Mail Carrier has to convey mails between the S. and Rajendranagar Delivery Delivery S.O. His workload is heavy and therefore it was fixed at 5 hours a day.

36

4. We have examined the case and heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the respondents. The applicant has furnished certain statistics. We find that the workload in the S.O. is very low. If we take up the money orders alone, not even one money order on an average is handled per day. The respondents have followed the procedure laid down by the Department and the workload being very low there is no case for us to interfere in this. If there is any difference in emoluments between the applicant and the Mail Carriers who are not a party before us it is on account of the revision of rates based on the recommendations of the E.D. Committee set up by the Govt. of India which is an expert body which goes into the whole aspect of E.D. working and makes the recommendations.

5. In the result, the application fails and we dismiss it with no order as to costs.

*MS*

( J. Narasimha Murthy )  
Member (Judl).

*R. Balasubramanian*  
( R. Balasubramanian ) ..  
Member (Admn).

*7.2*  
Dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 91

*8/8/91*  
Deputy Registrar (O).

To

- 1) The Superintendent of post office,  
Hyderabad South East Division, Hyderabad - 27
- 2) The postmaster General, Hyderabad - 1
- 3) one copy to Mr. B. Shankar Advocate,  
16-7-717, Hyderabad - 400001
- 4) one copy to Mr. N. Bhaskey Rao, Addl. Commr. C.A.T., Hyd
- 5) one copy to Mr. J. Narasimha Murthy, M(S) C.A.T., Hyd.
- 6) one spare copy

*B*

*Enclosed*