

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

R.A.No. 87798 IN

O.A.No. 272/96

Date: 12-09-96

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.VenkateswaraRao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.V.Bhimanna

---

CORAM :

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

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

*R*

---

2

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, learned 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 record, 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 <sup>on the merits</sup> ~~by perusal 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  
*even if his name carries 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 <sup>consider whether</sup> ~~the~~ candidate is  
 eligible for appointment or not.

6. The applicant also submits that the justification <sup>subsequently</sup> for issuing the notification is altered L 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.

प्रसाजित प्रति

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

क्रम संख्या RA 67/98 in  
CASE NUMBER OA 272/98

DATE OF JUDGEMENT ..... 31.12.98

CONFIDENTIAL - EYES ONLY 8-1199

स. न. अति. अ. न. / न्यायालय अधिकारी  
 S. N. Officer / Court Officer  
 के. न. न. न. न. न. न. अधिकरण  
 Central Administrative Tribunal  
 हैदराबाद न्यायापीठ  
 HYDERABAD BENCH.