

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 868 of 1993

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 29th July, 1993

BETWEEN:

1. Mr. A. Michael
2. Mr. M. Venkata Reddy
3. Mr. M. Baleiah
4. Mr. G. Satyanarayana .. Applicants

and

1. Union of India represented by
the Director General,
Department of Posts,
New Delhi-1.
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
A.P. Circle,
Hyderabad-1.
3. The Postmaster General,
Hyderabad Region,
Hyderabad-1.
4. The Superintendent,
RMS 'Z' Division,
Hyderabad-1. .. Respondents

APPEARANCE:

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS: Mr. P. Rattaiah, Advocate

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. N. R. Devaraj, Sr. CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri Justice V. Neeladri Rao, Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P. T. Thiruvengadam, Member (Admn.)

JUDGMENT OF THE DIVISION BENCH DELIVERED BY THE HON'BLE
SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

This application was filed challenging the orders as
per the proceedings dated 17.2.1993 issued by the 4th
respondent.

contd...

(39)

.. 2 ..

2. Heard Mr. P. Rattaiah for the applicants and Mr. N. R. Devaraj for the respondents. Malafides are not alleged against the 4th respondent. It is not shown that it is a case of pick and choose in the orders of transfer. The only contention for the applicants is that instead of identifying the relevant posts circle-wise they are being identified division-wise and the transfers are affected on that basis. Ofcourse, these posts of HSG Gr. II are circle posts. But still when the respondents are uniformly following the policy of transfer of the employees even in that category division-wise, the same cannot be held as arbitrary.

3. But it is submitted for the applicants that some of the employees in the districts to which these applicants are transferred are going to be promoted within a period of three months and if they are going to be accommodated in their respective places on promotion, then there may not be any reason to transfer these applicants and ~~for~~ they can be permitted to work in the office in which they are working for even the norms prescribed are to that effect. In case or the applicants that no one is posted in place in which the applicants are working and no inconvenience will be felt if they are retained in the places in which they are working. We feel that in the circumstances above it is open to the applicants, if they ~~are~~ are so advised, to make a representation in regard to the same and if it is going to be made, the concerned authority/authorities will naturally consider the same on merits without being influenced by the fact that the applicants are challenging the impugned order.

contd....

.. 3 ..

4. The OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage. No costs.

(Dictated in the open Court).

P. J. Das
(P.T.THIRUVENGADAM)
Member(Admn.)

V. Neeladri RAO
(V.NEELADRI RAO)
Vice Chairman

Dated: 29th July, 1993.

8-7/93
Deputy Registrar (J)

vsn

To

1. The Director General, Union of India,
Dept., of Posts, New Delhi-1.
2. The Chief Postmaster General, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad-1.
3. The Superintendent, RMS 'Z' Division, Hyderabad-1.
4. The Superintendent, RMS 'Z' Division, Hyderabad-1.
5. One copy to Mr.P.Rattaiah, Advocate, Advocates Association,
High Court of A.P.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

*300 ch
P.T. 3/8/93*

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTHY : MEMBER (A)

AND

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. P. T. TIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated: 29-7 -1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A/R.A/C.A.No.

in

O.A.No.

868/93

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

