

(17)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

..
O.A.No.787/94.
..

Date: 2--5--1997.

Between:

B. Venkateswarlu. Applicant.

and

1. The Senior Superintendent of
Post Offices, Prakasam Division,
Ongole.

2. Sri Chintala Venkateswarlu,
Branch Post Master, Goginenivaripalem,
Prakasam District,
(Now selected but not assumed
charge.

Respondents.

Counsel for the respondents: Sri V. Rajeswara Rao.

Per T. Rajendran

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN, Member(A)

HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR, Member(H)

--

JUDGMENT

(as per Hon'ble Shri B.S. Jai Parameswar, Member(J))

None for the applicant. The applicant was
called absent. Heard Sri V. Rajeswara Rao. Counsel for the
respondents. No.1. / Respondent No.2 was served but ^{he has} not
entered appearance either in person or through his counsel.

The Respondent No.1 has not filed counter
to the O.A. However, we have perused the records produced
by the 1st respondent during the course of arguments.

The post of B.P.M., Goginenivaripalem in
Prakasam District which fell vacant on the demise of

of the regular incumbent of the said ~~Branch Post Office~~.

It is stated that the applicant was appointed on provisional basis ^{to} ~~in~~ the post on 3--5~~8~~-1993 and has since been continuing as such. To fill up the said post by a regular candidate, the Respondent No.1 issued a Notification dated 15--7--1993. In response to the said Notification, three candidates submitted their applications, viz., the Applicant, the 2nd respondent and the other one. The applicant had filed O.A. No. 454/94 for not considering his candidature before this Tribunal. The said O.A., was disposed of with the following direction:-

"In case the applicant filed the application with all the relevant certificates other than the SSC certificate by 16--8--1993 and if that original SSC certificate was taken return from the respondent and submitted again, the case of the applicant has to be considered in accordance with law by treating that the original SSC Certificate was submitted within time."

Thereafter, it appears that the applicant has not at all submitted any application or income certificate or testimonials. Therefore, the 1st respondent considered the application filed by the 2nd respondent and the other candidate. From the records, produced by the Authorities, it is disclosed that the applicant inspite of clear directions by the Tribunal in O.A 454/94 ~~he~~ failed to furnish the Certificates mentioned in the Order in

: 3 :

O.A. 454/94 for consideration ^{by} of the Authorities.

Even the applicant had not submitted the other required

* certificates along with the application before the
- for receipt -

last date/~~of receipt~~ of the applications. When the
- had -

applicant himself ^{had} failed to furnished the required

particulars before the last date ^{for} receipt of the


applications, his candidature cannot be considered

as a regular one. Hence the applicant cannot question

the ^{-ment} appoint of the 2nd respondent as BPM, Goginenivaripalem,

~~Krishna District~~ Prakasam District.

There are no merits in this O.A. Hence
the O.A., is dismissed. No order as to costs.


(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR
MEMBER, (J)
2.5.97

(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (A)

Date: 2--55-1997.


Dictated in open Court.

Deputy Registrar

SSS.

NOTE:

The records to be returned
verification.

(B.O.)


13/6/97
TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

6
CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.R. AGARWAL : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR :
M(J)

DATED: 2/5/97

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

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

in
O.A. No.

787/97

ADMITTED INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED
ALLOWED
DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS
DISMISSED
DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN
ORDERED/REJECTED
NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLKR

II COURT

