

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

R.A.No. 67798 in

O.A.No. 272/96

Date

BETWEEN :

P.Ramulu

AND

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Hanumakonda Division, Hanumakonda.
2. The Director of Postal Services, Hyderabad Region, Hyderabad.
3. Sri Abdul Kareem

.. Respondents.



Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. V. Bhimanna

CORAM :

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

HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARADESHWAR : MEMBER (JUDL.)

R

D

O R D E R

X As per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (Admn.) X

Mr. K.Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. V.Bhimanna, learnes standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant in this OA has filed this RA for reviewing the judgement of this Bench dated 10.9.98.
3. The main point ~~that~~ the applicant wants to insist is that the OA was dismissed without looking into the records in regard to the selection made on the basis of the second notification. He submits that the private respondents having failed to qualify in the first notification could not have been selected in the second notification and hence perusal of the record is essential.
4. This Bench normally peruses the records before passing any order in similar cases.
5. We heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the applicant. We have given the reasons for dismissing the OA elaborately in paras-4 and 5 of the judgement. The applicant having submitted himself to the second notification ~~cannot challenge that notification, by perusing of the records~~ No further relief can be given to the applicant in view of the above view point. Further the possibility of the

R

1

private respondent to qualify for the post cannot be
~~evenly his/her Case was rejected earlier~~
ruled out. It is not for the Tribunal to see whether the
private respondent qualified in the second notification or
not. It is for the department to ~~consider whether~~ the candidate is
eligible for appointment or not.

6. The applicant also submits that the justification
~~subsequently~~
for issuing the notification is altered ~~which is not~~ which is not
necessary to look into. He should challenge the notification
and obtain orders soon after the issue of the notification.

7. From the above analysis it is evident that there is no
error in the judgement, hence the RA is dismissed. No costs.

प्रमाणित प्रति

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY,

क्रम संख्या RA 67/98 म
CASE NUMBER O.A. 272/96

निधान निवास

DATE OF JUDGEMENT 31.12.98

प्रमाणित करने वाला

CERTIFIED COPY ON 8.1.99.

Praveen

स. ओ. ऑफिसर/दायरालय अधिकारी

S. O. Officer/Court Officer

केंद्रीय नियुक्ति अधिकरण

Central Administrative Tribunal

हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ

HYDERABAD BENCH.