

9

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

R.A.No. 42/94
in
O.A.No. 337/94.

Dt. of Decision : 14.7.94.

... N. V. R. Reddy

.. Applicant.

Vs

The Superintendent of Post Office .. respondent.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. S. Ramakrishna Rao

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. N. V. Raghava Reddy,
Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

(10)

R.A.NO.42/94 in OA 337/94.

JUDGMENT

Dt: 14.7.94

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN)

Heard Shri S.Ramakrishna Rao, learned counsel
for the applicant and Mr. Jayadeva Murthy, learned
standing counsel for the respondents.

2. OA 337/94 was disposed of by the order dated 28.4.1994 by observing that there was no reversion as far as for the letter dated 15.2.1994 which was challenged. L in the said G.A. ~~by him and hence the only direction that was given is~~ that the applicant cannot be replaced by another adhoc promotee.

3. It is now contended in this Review Application that the applicant was reverted on 9.5.1994 as Postman and the order of reversion is illegal as his promotion to the post of Mail Overseer was a regular promotion though it was styled as adhoc promotion. If the applicant is aggrieved by the order of reversion and if he is so advised, he can challenge it by filing appropriate proceeding and it is not a case for review of the order dated 28.4.1994 in OA 337/94.// Thus, this RA does not merit consideration and accordingly it is dismissed. This order does not debar the applicant to file OA against the order of reversion and if it is so filed, it will be considered on merits.

(R.RANGARAJAN)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Neeladri
(V.NEELADRI RAO)
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 14th July, 1994.
Open court dictation.

Amulya 18.7.94
Dy. Registrar (Jud1)