

6/

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

* * *

3

Date of Decision: 17.7.95.

OA 308/95

Mrs. Pratibha Singh w/o Shri Laxman Singh, Aged about 38 years,
Postal Assistant, SECO Kota Headquarter under Sr. Supdt. Post
Office, Kota.

...APPLICANT.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through Secretary to the Govt. of India,
Ministry of Communication (Department of Post), Dak
Bhawan, New Delhi-1.
2. The Post Master General, Rajasthan Southern Region,
Ajmer.
3. The Director (Postal Services), Rajasthan Southern
Region, Ajmer.

... RESPONDENTS.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. GOPAL KRISHNA, VICE CHAIRMAN.

For the Applicant

... SRI J.K. KAUSHIK.

For the Respondents

...

O R D E R ,

PER HON'BLE MR. GOPAL KRISHNA, VICE CHAIRMAN.

Smt. Pratibha Singh has filed this application u/s 19 of
the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, assailing the order dated
27.6.95 at Annexure A-1, by which she was transferred from Kota
to Bhilwara Headquarter.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant. The
applicant is serving as an Upper Division Clerk. She has also
earned her promotion in the next higher grade of Rs.1400-2300 on
completion of 16 years of service, vide order dated 27.12.94.
She was posted at Kota but by the impugned order she has been
transferred to Bhilwara. She states that she has been suffering
from kidney diseases ever since 1990 and she has been
continuously undergoing treatment for the same. She has referred
in her application to para-4 of the rotational transfer policy/
guidelines, which provides that, "SECO staff are circle cadre.
However, in order to ensure that there is minimum inconvenience

...2.

to the staff on account of the rotational transfer, their transfer may be done within the Division or neighbouring Division as far as possible." She has pleaded that she could have been transferred within the Eastern Region or out of adjoining Western Region. The applicant has admittedly not made any representation to the concerned authority before approaching this Tribunal.

3. In the circumstances, the present OA is disposed of at the stage of admission with a direction to respondent No.2 to dispose of the representation of the applicant, if it is made within 10 days of this order. The respondent No.2 shall dispose of the representation within a period of one month of the receipt thereof in terms of the guidelines at Annexure A-6 for the year 1995-96 through a speaking order. If the applicant is aggrieved by any decision taken on her representation, she may file a fresh OA, if so advised. Let a copy of this order alongwith a copy of the OA be sent to respondent No.2.

C. Krishna
(GOFAL KRISHNA)
VICE CHAIRMAN

VK