

29

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

RA 71/99 in OA 994/99

DT. OF ORDER : 13.12.1999.

Between :-

Sayyed Khasim

Applicant/Respondent No.5

And

1. Union of India, rep. by Chief Postmaster General, Daksadan, Abids, Hyderabad.
2. The Postmaster General, Southern Region, Kurnool-518 004.
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nandyal Division - Nandyal-518 501.
4. The Sub Divisional Inspector of Post Offices, CUMBUM (K) Sub Division, Cumbum (K) - 523333.

Respondents

5. M.Kasaiah

Respondent No.5/Applicant

--- --- ---

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri K.Narahari for RR 1 to 4
Shri URS Gurupadam for R-5

--- --- ---

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI D.H.NASIR : VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

--- --- ---

... 2.



(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

-- -- --

Heard Sri URS Gurupadam, learned counsel for the applicant in O.A.994/99. This Review Application is filed by Respondent No.5 in the Original Application. Sri Krishna Devan has filed his vakalatnama for the applicant in the Review Application. This Review Application was repeatedly adjourned at the request of Sri Krishna Devan. Even today he is not present and requested for adjournment. We do not consider it necessary to adjourn this Review Application, as this Review Application had been adjourned number of times at his request. Heard Sri K.Narahari for the official respondents.

2. As stated earlier, Review Application has been filed by the Respondent No.5 in the Original Application. The main contentions are analysed as follows :-

- (i) The Respondent No.5 was not heard while disposing of the OA 994/99 on 16.8.1999. This does not appear to be correct as we have already stated in the order that ~~Smt~~ T.V.V.S.Murthy represented Respondent No.5;
- (ii) The second contention of the applicant in the Review Application is that the applicant in the Review Application is more meritorious. This point has already been considered in para-5 of the judgement wherein we have stated that the Respondent No.5 passed the SSC examination in compartmental attempt;

1

- 3 -

(iii) The 3rd contention of the applicant is that the applicant in the O.A. do not possess the property certificate.

The post for which the applicant applied is EDMC/DA at Rama-chandrapuram Branch Post Office. For those posts it is not necessary to produce the property certificate. Hence this contention is also rejected. //A study of the judgement clearly indicates that all the contentions raised in the Review Application are considered fully. Apparently there was no error in the judgement. Hence the Review Application is dismissed. No costs.

3. As the Review Application is disposed of, MA 734/99

is dismissed.



(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (A)



(D.H. NASIR)
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 13th December, 1999.
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/

