

OA.No.170/00077/2017/CAT/BANGALORE

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.170/00077/2017

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2018

HON'BLE DR.K.B.SURESH, MEMBER (J)

HON'BLE SHRI DINESH SHARMA, MEMBER (A)

Madhura K,

W/o Yathish K.B

Aged 25 years, Paneyala House,

Karike Post,

Bhagamandala Hobli – 571 247,

Madikeri Taluk,

Kodagu District,

.....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri K. Govindaraj)

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Represented by its Secretary,
Ministry of Communications & IT,
Department of Posts (GDS Section)
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi – 110 001

2. Superintendent of Post Offices
and CPIO,
Kodagu Division,
Madikeri – 571 201

3. Smt. Bindu,
D/O Dandina Puttappa,
Thannimani Village,
Bhagamandala Hobli – 571 247
Madikeri taluk,
Kodagu District

....Respondents

(By Shri K. Gajendra Vasu, Senior Panel Counsel)

O R D E R (ORAL)

(HON'BLE DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER (J))

Heard. The applicant was an applicant for the post of GDS and she had answered in Clause No. 9 that she does not know cycling and in Clause No. 11 that she cannot provide free accommodation to house the post office in the village if selected. There are two other grounds also raised by the respondents that applicant had given an incorrect format while providing OBC certificate but that we can safely ignore. But then if she cannot provide a free accommodation for the post office then quite obviously she cannot be selected.

2. Shri Govindaraj, learned counsel for the applicant, at this point submits

that actually the applicant had committed a small mistake. She being a resident of the same village, she will be able to give a free accommodation but then this applies equally and universally to all the candidates who appeared. The candidates are selected not only on the basis of the qualifying marks required but also on the basis of other parameters as provided by the respondents. At this point of time we do not find a way in which to provide her an opportunity to retract her statement in her application and give another chance. If given such a chance, then it will be an unending marathon as other candidates who had been in that process also will have to be re-heard once again. That the respondents need not undertake at this juncture. We do not find anything wrong in the findings made by the respondents. The OA lacks merit. The OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(DINESH SHARMA)

MEMBER (A)

(DR.K.B.SURESH)

MEMBER (J)

/ksk/

Annexures referred to by the applicant in OA No. 170/00077/2017

Annexure A1 Copy of the communication dated 14.01.2015

Annexure A2 and 3 Copies of the application submitted by the applicant

Annexure A4 Copy of the birth certificate of the applicant

Annexure A5 Copy of the SSLC certificate of the applicant

Annexure A6 Copy of the certificate of Tally

Annexure A7 Copy of the SSLC certificate of Respondent No.3

Annexure A8 Copy of the computer training certificate of R3

Annexure A9 Copy of the letter of selection

Annexure A10 Copy of the reply dated 20.10.2016

Annexure A11 Copy of the letter dated 04.11.2016

Annexures with reply statement

Annexure R1 Copy of the Notification dated 04.05.2016

Annexure R2 Copy of the Minutes of the selection process to the post of GDS

* * * * *