THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR
ORDER SHEET

APPLICATION NO.: _____

(6)

Applicant(s) | Respondent (s)

Advocate for Applicant (s) | Advocate for Respondent (s)

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY	ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL
Rejoinder ~~dated~~ filed.	**05.07.2007** **OA No. 133/2004** **Mr. P.N. Jatti, Counsel for applicant.** **Mr. Kunal Rawat, Sr. Standing Counsel for respondents.** **On the request of the learned counsel for the parties, list the case for final hearing on 10.07.2007. IR to continue till the next date.** **(J.P. SHUKLA)** **MEMBER (A)** **AHQ**
	10.7.07 Mr. P.N. Jatti, counsel for applicant. Mr. Kunal Rawat, counsel for respdts. Heard the learned counsel for the parties. The OA stands dismissed by a separate order. (J.P. Shukla) M(A)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

Jaipur, the 10th day of July, 2007

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.133/2007

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR.J.P.SHUKLA, ADMINISITRATIVE MEMBER

Navin Kumar,
W.C. (Work Clerk) Grade-I
O/o Assistant Engineer,
Postal Civil Sub Division-II,
Shastri Nagar,
Jaipur.

By Advocate : Shri P.N.Jatti

... Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through
Secretary to the Govt.,
Department of Posts,
Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi.

2. Chief Engineer (Civil),
Department of Posts,
South West Zone & Mysore Road,
Banglore.

3. Superintending Engineer,
Postal Civil Circle,
Narainpura,
Vistar Post Office Building,
Ahamedabad.

4. Executive Engineer,
Postal Civil Division,
Shastri Nagar,
Jaipur.

5. Assistant Engineer,
Postal Sub Division-II,
Shastri Nagar,
Jaipur.

By Advocate : Shri Kunal Rawat

... Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

PER HON'BLE MR.J.P.SHUKLA

Heard the learned counsel for the parties. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the transfer order in question is arbitrary and discriminatory. He cited the case of **S.Ramagangi Reddi v. Government of A.P. & Ors.,** 1992 Lab. I.C 1113 Andhra Pradesh High Court, for seeking intervention by this Tribunal as the impugned order has been issued for collateral purposes or as an instrument of harassment or for punishing an employee. He further submitted that applicant's representation dated 17.4.2007 (Ann.A/2) has not yet been decided by the respondents and prayed for the decision thereof by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that there has been absolutely no case of malafides and there has been no violation of any statutory rule. The transfer order in question has been issued by the competent authority in public interest and the administrative work is suffering.

3. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, this tribunal would not like to interfere anymore in this case. Hence this OA is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(J.P.SHUKLA)
MEMBER (A)

vk