

36

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: AT HYDERABAD.

O.A. No. 828/89

Date of Decision: 13.10.92

T.A. No.

P.Raman Goud

Petitioner.

Mr. T.Jayant

Advocate for
the Petitioner(s)

versus
Union of India, rep. by the Secretary,

Ministry of Communications, New Delhi and 3 others.

Respondent.

Mr. N.R.Devraj.

Advocate for
the Respondent
(s)

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. A.B.GORTHI, MEMBER (ADMN.)

THE HON'BLE MR. T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY, MEMBER (JUD L.)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters 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
(HABG)
M(A)

T.C.R
(HTCSR)
M(J)

37

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.828/99

Date of Order: 13.10.1992

BETWEEN:

P.RamanGoud

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. Union of India, rep. by
the Secretary, Ministry
of Communications,
New Delhi - 1.

2. Post Master General,
A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.

3. Superintendent of Post
Offices, Mahabubnagar
Division, Mahabubnagar.

4. M.Thimmappa, selected B.P.M.
of Induvasi B.O. at Indivasi, ^{Alw Market in S.O.}
Mahabubnagar Dt. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.T.Jayant

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.N.R.Devraj. ^{S.C.W.C.}

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI, MEMBER (ADMN.)

HON'BLE SHRI T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY, MEMBER (JUDL.)

(Order of the Division Bench delivered by

Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (Admn.)).

Order of the Division Bench delivered by
Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (Admn.)

Aggrieved by his non-selection for appointment as the Branch Post Master (B.P.M.) of Induvasi, the applicant has approached the Tribunal seeking the relief that he be appointed to that post on regular basis and that the selection of the 4th respondent to that post be quashed.

2. The applicant was appointed on a provisional basis as the B.P.M. of Induvasi, Branch Office on 4.1.1984 in the vacancy which occurred on account ~~as~~ ^{of} ~~that~~ previous incumbent having been 'put off' from duty. He continued in the said appointment till 7.6.1989 when a notification was issued by the official respondents calling for candidates for selection and regular appointment as B.P.M. Induvasi B.O. The applicant also forwarded his application together with the required certificates. He was not selected. One Sri M.Thimmappa (respondent No.4) who also applied for the said post was selected and the applicant was directed to handover charge to the said Sri M.Thimmappa.

3. Today we have heard Mr.T.Jayant, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.N.R.Devraj, Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant strongly contended that in view of the experience gained by the applicant, his candidature should ~~not~~ have been rejected by the respondents in favour of respondent No.4 who did not have any such experience. The applicant is fully qualified and eligible in all respects for being appointed as B.P.M. Therefore the respondents were not justified in non-selecting the applicant for the said post.

5. The respondents refuted the averments made in the reply affidavit by clarifying that a proper selection was held and that Sri Thimmappa was selected on merit, he having secured

.. 3 ..

more marks in the S.S.C. examination than the applicant. Moreover the applicant failed to produce proof in support of income and property which was an essential requisite ~~for~~ considering the applicant for appointment as B.P.M.

6. After perusing the record before us, we find that the respondents have neither acted mala fide nor have violated any rules in conducting the selection of the candidate for the post of B.P.M. Induvasi. The applicant admittedly had considerable experience in the post of B.P.M., but that by itself does not entitle him to claim appointment as a matter of right. The respondents having carried out a proper selection and having selected a candidate whom they considered the most suitable amongst all the candidates, there is hardly any justification for us to interfere. In view of these facts and circumstances, the relief sought by the applicant cannot be granted and the application is hereby dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

transcript
(A.B.GORTHI)
Member (Admn.)

T. Chandrasekhar Reddy
(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: 13th October, 1992

(Dictated in Open Court)

To
 1. The Secretary, Union of India Ministry
 2. ^{sd} of Communications, New Delhi.
 3. The Post Master General, A.P.
 4. One copy to Mr. T. Venkayya, Advocate, C.A.T. Hyderabad.
 5. One copy to Mr. N.R. Devraj, Advocate, C.A.T. Hyderabad.
 6. One copy to Mr. N.R. Devraj, Advocate, C.A.T. Hyderabad.

p.m.

Deputy

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR

AND A. B. (notary)

THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY:
M(JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER (JUDL)

Dated: 13 -10 -1992

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

R.A. /C.A. /M.A. NC

in

C.A. No. 828 | 89

T.A. No.

(wp. No.)

Admitted and interim directions issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered/Rejected

No orders as to costs.

Central Administrative Tribunal

DESPATCH

19 NOV 1992