

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA No.2865/2018

New Delhi, this the 31st day of July, 2018

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

L. R. Vishwanath
Director General (South), PIB Chennai
Camp Office New Delhi
Aged about 58 years,
S/o Late L. V. Ramasesh
R/o 058, Chhota Singh Block,
Asian Games Village,
New Delhi 110 049. Applicant.

(By Advocate, Shri Vinay Kumar Mishra)

Vs.

1. Union of India & ors.
Through its Secretary
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
6th Floor, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Prasar Bharti
Through its Chief Executive Officer
Prasar Bharti House, Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi.
3. The Director General
Doordarshan
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi. ... Respondents.

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman:

Doordarshan which was the source of information for decades together has suffered serious dent to its popularity in the recent past. Some of the senior most

officers in the Indian Information Service have kept their private and family affairs, above the interest of Doordarshan. The result is there to see.

2. The applicant is said to be the senior most officer in the Indian Information Service. Almost for the entire service, he was stationed in Delhi. In the year 2017, he was transferred to a station at Vijayvada. Challenging the order of transfer, he filed OA No.4256/2017. Initially, the stay was granted by this Tribunal, and thereafter it was vacated. Having joined the station at Vijayvada, almost in a perfunctory manner, he applied for leave and did not work in that place at all.

3. Through an Order No.91/2018-IIS dated 04.07.2018, the Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting promoted the applicant from the Senior Administrative Grade to the Selection Grade, and obviously because, a post of that nature is available at Chennai, he was posted against the vacancy. The present OA is filed challenging the order dated 04.07.2018.

4. We heard Shri Vinay Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant, and Shri D. S. Mahendru, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and Ms. Vartika Sharma, learned counsel on behalf of respondent Nos.2 & 3.

5. The applicant has pleaded the grounds of ill health of family members and education of children. It needs to be noted that these grounds are available for everyone, unless the entire family is immunized from any scope of ill health or aging process. Being the senior most officer, the applicant was supposed to lead the entire team and to act as a source of inspiration for his juniors and other employees in the organization. The series of events would only disclose that he kept his family and personal interest above everything, and Doordarshan came secondary. We do not appreciate such an approach. It is not, as if, there are no facilities for treatment of any person suffering from ill health at Chennai.

6. The OA is accordingly dismissed. There is no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/pj/