

(12)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

OA.1724/97

dt.29-12-97

Between

Smt. Anita R. Kulkarni : Applicant

and

1. Dy. Director

Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau  
Min. of Home Affairs  
Govt. of India  
Hyderabad 500004

2. Jt. Director

Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau  
Min. of Home Affairs  
Govt. Of India  
Hyderabad

3. Director

Intelligence Bureau  
Min. of Home Affairs  
Govt. of India  
New Delhi

: Respondents

Counsel for the applicant

: D. Linga Rao  
Advocate

Counsel for the respondents

: N.R. Devaraj  
OGSC

CORAM

HON. MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.)

## Order

Oral Order (per Hon. Mr. H. Rajendra Prasad, Member (Admn.))

Heard Mr. D. Linga Rao for the applicant and Mr. N.R. Devaraj for the respondents.

1. The applicant was initially posted in the North-East in 1993 and was later posted from Dibrugarh to Hyderabad in 1997. It is stated on behalf of the applicant that her posting to Hyderabad was under the provisions of incentives contained in Government of India, Ministry of Finance OM. 20014/3/83-E.IV dated 14-12-1997, wherein it is mentioned inter-alia that officers on completion of their tenure in the North-Eastern Region may be considered for posting to a station of their choice as far as possible. It is the assertion of the applicant that she has been posted to 'Hyderabad station'. It is however, clarified by Mr. Devaraj that the expression 'Hyderabad' in the present context merely denotes 'Hyderabad Region' which has in it a number of stations throughout Andhra Pradesh. The posting from Dibrugarh 'region' to Hyderabad 'region' it is explained, was the preliminary step in the process of actual posting of the applicant. And the <sup>next</sup> step has now been taken by the Joint Director, SIB, Hyderabad, vide his order dated 3-9-97 in posting the applicant to a particular 'station', viz. Adilabad. Mr. N.R. Devaraj, further adds that the applicant, on allotment to Hyderabad Region, was merely on hold in the regional directorate before she was eventually posted to Adilabad. The learned counsel mentions also that in posting her to Adilabad, they have taken care simultaneously to post her <sup>husband</sup> <sub>same</sub> <sup>^</sup> who works in a similar capacity in the <sup>same</sup> <sub>^</sub> organisation, to the very same station

i.e. Adilabad, and to that extent the guidelines issued by the Government regarding posting of a husband and wife to the same station has been duly kept in view and complied with.

2. The applicant projects certain personal difficulties in carrying out the order of posting to Adilabad. Among other problems, the couple have a child who is less than an year old, and it is her main worry that Adilabad may not be congenial or very/conducive to the child in terms of climate, etc.

3. According to Mr. Devaraj, the problems projected by the applicant have been duly considered by the Respondent-2 and 3 separately and successively, and though they are aware of the possible difficulties of the applicant, it has not been found administratively feasible to alter or amend the posting order already issued or to retain the applicant at Hyderabad. It was indicated that her request for reposting to Hyderabad will be considered at an appropriate juncture at a not-too-distant date, subject, again, to administrative exigencies, with sympathy.

4. The above position is noted and is regarded as sufficiently encouraging for the applicant who may make a representation, if she chooses to do so, to the concerned authorities after she carries out the impugned order of transfer and posting. There can be little doubt that the problems and difficulties of the applicant shall be duly considered by the authorities with a view to providing her necessary relief at an appropriate time in a reasonably near future. The impugned order cannot, in the meanwhile, be set aside or interfered with.

5. Thus the OA is disposed of at the admission stage

— *R. Rajendra Prasad* —  
(R. Rajendra Prasad)  
Member (Admn.)

Dated : December 29, 97  
Dictated in Open Court

..3..

## Copy to:

1. Dy. Director, Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau, Min. of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, Hyderabad.
2. Dt. Director, Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau, Min. of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, Hyderabad.
3. Director, Intelligence Bureau, Min. of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
4. One copy to Mr. D. Linga Rao, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to D. R(A), CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One copy to duplicate.

YLKR

87/1998  
ccxodar  
TYPED BY  
COMPARED BY

I.C.C.  
CHECKED BY  
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE  
VICE-CHAIRMAN  
AND

THE HON'BLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD: M(A)

DATED: 29 - 12-1997

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in

O.A.No. 1724/97

T.A.No.

(W.R.)

Admitted and Interim directions  
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with direction

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

Ordered Rejected.

No order as to costs.

p.v.m.

