

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.2378/2014

Wednesday, this the 1st day of June 2016

Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Basu, Member (A)

L Mythili, Postal Assistant
w/o Major Rajan G,
Aged about 43 years
P-3, Kirby Place, Delhi Cantt.

..Applicant

(Mr. M.K. Bhardwaj, Advocate)

Versus

Union of India & others through:

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Communication & IT
Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi
2. The Director General
Ministry of Communication & IT
Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi
3. The Chief Posts Master General
Delhi Circle, Department of Posts
Meghdoot Bhawan, Link Road, New Delhi
4. The Chief Posts Master General
Tamilnadu Circle, Chennai
5. The Sr. Superintendent Posts
Chanakya Puri
New Delhi

..Respondents

(Mr. Rajinder Nischal, Advocate)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Vide order 03.04.2013 (Annexure A-5), the applicant was transferred from Chennai City South Division Tamilnadu Circle, Chennai to Sarojini Nagar HO Delhi Circle for a period of one year from the date she joined at a transferred place where she joined on 13.04.2013. Thereafter she requested

for extension of temporary transfer by another two years vide her representation dated 25.03.2014 (Annexure A-6), which period is already over on 24.03.2016.

2. The applicant's prayer in this Original Application is as follows:-

“i. To quash and set aside the impugned transfer Letter dated 17.06.2014 and allow the applicant to continue in Delhi being the place of posting of her husband.

ii. To declare the action of respondents in not allowing three year temporary transfer to applicant as illegal and arbitrary.

iii. To direct the respondents to allow the applicant to complete three years on temporary transfer in Delhi as Postal Assistant.

iv. To allow the OA with cost.

v. To pass any such other order as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Annexure A-1 order dated 17.06.2014 is a direction to the Senior Postmaster, Sarojini Nagar HP, New Delhi, where the applicant is posted, to relieve her for parent Circle, which is Chennai Circle.

4. Heard the learned counsels for the parties and perused the record.

5. The applicant had been accommodated in Delhi Circle; first for one year on the ground of her husband being posted in Delhi Circle and thereafter she was given another two years' extension in Delhi Circle, which also expired on 16.05.2016. It is also stated that her husband is now posted in Andaman.

6. Therefore, nothing survives in the present Original Application and the same is accordingly dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

(P.K. Basu)
Member (A)

June 1, 2016
/sunil/