

40

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.577/1996.

Date of decision: 30-12-1998.

Between:

A. Subba Reddy. Applicant

and

1. The Director of Postal Services,
P & T Department, Kurnool, Kurnool Dt.

2. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Proddutur Division, Proddutur.

3. The Chief Post Master General,
Hyderabad.

4. G.Surya Venanarayana Reddy. .. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant: Sri J.V.Prasad.

Counsel for the Respondents: Sri B. Narasimha Sarma,
Sr. S. P. SCSC

Coram.

Hon'ble Sri R. Rangarajan, Member (A)

Hon'ble Sri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J)

JUDGMENT.

(by Hon'ble Sri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J))

Hear Mr. Prabhakar for J.V. Prasad, applicant's Counsel.

None for the applicant. Heard Sri B. Narasimha Sarma, Senior CGSC for the respondents 1 to 3.

Notice has been served on the 4th Respondent. He has remained absent.

A

: 2 :

2. The post of E.O.B.P.M., Gollalagudur Branch Post Office fell vacant on account of the resignation of the incumbent of that post on his selection as Postman. The respondents requisitioned the local Employment Exchange for sponsoring the eligible candidates to fill up the said post on regular basis. There was no response from the local Employment Exchange.

3. Pending selection, the applicant was appointed to the post on provisional basis. Hence an open Notification was issued on 24.1.1996 by the 2nd respondent. In response to the said Notification four applications including that of the applicant and that of the Respondent No.4 were received.

4. After verification and scrutiny of the applications received, the Respondent Authorities selected the 4th respondent and appointed him to that post of EDBPM, Gollalagudur. The Respondent No.4 took charge of the BO on 7.5.1996.

5. Being aggrieved by the selection and appointment of the 4th respondent, the applicant has filed this O.A., challenging the selection and appointment of the 4th respondent as EDBPM of Gollalagudur Branch Post Office.

6. The applicant in the O.A., had submitted that the 4th respondent was selected on account of political influence, that the 4th respondent was not having any property in his name, that the Respondent No.4 had produced bogus Pattedar Pass Book at the time of verification and that the land indicated in the Pattedar Pass Book is not a cultivable land. He states that he stood meritorious than the 4th respondent.

7. The Respondents in their counter have stated that they had taken into consideration the marks scored by the applicant and the 4th respondent in the SSC Examination, that the selection of the 4th respondent was not made on account of any political pressure, that the Pattedar Pass Book as well as the certificate issued by the M.R.O. Vemula, the Respondent No.4 possessed land in his own name and that the averment made by the applicant that the Pattedar Pass Book produced by Respondent No.4 was a bogus ~~Copycat~~ one is not. On perusal of the records, the said version is not borne out from the records.

8. At the time of hearing the case, the Respondent Nos., 1 to 3 had produced the selection proceedings. On going through the selection proceedings, the applicant had scored 357/500 marks in the SSC Examination whereas the selected candidate viz., the 4th respondent had secured 365/500 marks. Hence the contention

43

: 4 :

of the applicant that he was meritorious than the selected candidate cannot be accepted.

9. The applicant also submits that the 4th respondent was not residing in the village since 10 years and he was working in a private company at Hyderabad and was staying there only. For selecting a suitable candidate for the post of EUBPM, residence in the village is not ^a pre-condition. The selected candidate can after appointment make arrangement for his stay at Gollalagudur to run the Post Office. Hence, this contention of the applicant is not accepted.

10. After hearing the learned Senior Standing counsel for the Respondent Nos., 1 to 3 and perusing the selection proceedings, we are unable to accept any of the contentions of the applicant. The selection of the Respondent No.4 is in order.

11. In view of the above discussion, the O.A., has no merits and it is accordingly dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

12. The records produced by the Department will be returned to them.

B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR
B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR,
Member (J)
31.12.98

31/12/98
Date: December 31, 1998.

Dictated in open Court.

R.RANGARAJAN
R.RANGARAJAN,
Member (A)

Amily
7-1-98

7/1/99

II COURT

copy to :-

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

1) HBSJP
2) DR(A)
3) spare.

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN M(A)

AND

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

DATED: 31-12-98

✓ ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.R.A./C.P.NO.

in

OA. NO. 577/96

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED

ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

SRR

8 e copy.

