

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 85/89 198  
~~TA No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 29-1-1992

N.Venkata Ramana Petitioner

Mr.V.Raja Gopala Reddy Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Superintendent of Post Offices, Respondent  
Rejahmundry. and 2 others

Mr.NR.Devraj Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. R.BALASUBRAMANIAN : MEMBER (Admn.)

The Hon'ble Mr. C.J.ROY : MEMBER (Judl.)

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 Judgement?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

MGIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000

(HRBS)  
M(A)

(HCJR)  
M(J)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.85/89

Date of order: 29.1.1992

BETWEEN.

N.Venkata Ramana

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Superintendent of  
Post Offices,  
Rajahmundry Division,  
Rajahmundry - 533 101.
2. The Assistant Superintendent,  
of Post Offices,  
Rajahmundry Division,  
Rajahmundry - 533 101.
3. M.Satyanarayana. .. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant .. Mr.V.Raja Gopala Reddy.

Counsel for the Respondents .. Mr.NR.Devraj, <sup>Not present</sup> ~~Dadu Chye~~

---

CORAM:

HON'BLE Mr.R.BALASUBRAMANIAN : MEMBER (Admn.)

HON'BLE Mr.C.J.ROY : MEMBER (Judl.)

----

(This Judgement is dictated by Hon'ble Mr.R.Balasubramanian:  
Member (Admn.) on 29.1.92)

---

When the case was called on 24.1.92 neither the  
applicant nor his counsel was present and this old case was  
posted for dismissal today. When the case was called again  
today the situation is same and hence the Bench decided to  
<sup>adjudicate</sup> ~~decide~~ the case on merits <sup>with</sup> available <sup>material</sup>. Mr.NR.Devraj, Advocate  
for the respondents argued the case.

CONTD....2

2. The applicant who had only passed the 7th class, was working as a substitute EDDA at Ilakolanu Village. When he was sought to be replaced by a regular incumbent, he was aggrieved and represented to the respondents. Not being successful, he has approached this Tribunal through this application with a prayer seeking a direction to the respondents to appoint him as EDMC/DA, Ilakolanu against the vacant post of EDDA.

3. The respondents have filed a counter affidavit opposing the admission. It is pointed out that the applicant has only passed 7th standard and does not fulfil the minimum educational qualification required under the rules for the said post.

4. In view of the above, we find that the applicant is not eligible for that post. The O.A. is, therefore, dismissed with no order as to costs.

*R. Balasubramanian*  
( R. Balasubramanian )  
Member(A).

*C. J. Roy*  
( C. J. Roy )  
Member(J).

Dated: 29th Jan., 1992.

*A. S. H.*  
Dy. Registrar(J)

(Dictated in the Open Court).

To

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
sd. Rajahmundry Division, Rajahmundry -533 101.
2. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Rajahmundry Division, Rajahmundry - 533 101.
3. One copy to Mr. V. Raja Gopala Reddy, Advocate,  
3-5-942, "Shri Mayee", Himayatnagar, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm.

*2021st  
page  
file*

23/12/92  
2

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. ✓ V.C.

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: 29-1-1992 ✓

~~ORDER~~/JUDGMENT:

Central Administrative Tribunal  
DESPATCH

R.A./C.A./M.A./N.C.

12/32 242  
HYDERABAD BENCH:

O.A.No. 85/89 ✓

T.A.No.

(W.P.No. )

Admitted and interim directions  
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed ✓

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

M.A. Ordered/ Rejected

No order as to costs. ✓

pvn.

23/12/92