

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Monday 12th day of March Two Thousand And Eighteen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)

O.A. 310/00341/2018

R. Prem Sai,
J.Peon,
CCM/PM/O/MAS,
Southern Railway,
Chennai- 600 003.

.....Applicant

(By Advocate : M/s. P. Manikannan)

VS.

1. The Union of India Rep. by
The General Manager,
Southern Railway, Park Town,
Chennai- 600 003;
2. The Chief Personal Officer,
Administration,
Southern Railway, Park Town,
Chennai-600 003.

... ..Respondents

(By Advocate:)

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member (A))

Heard. Learned counsel for the applicant submits the applicant is aggrieved by Annexure-13, impugned order dated 16.08.2017, by which his representation for promotion to the post of Jr. Clerk had been rejected. It is alleged that the applicant had obtained 73.63 marks out of total marks of 100 as per Annexure -11 communication dated 19.09.2016 whereas the marks scored by one M. Karthikayan who had been selected for promotion was only 73.50 out of 100 marks as per Annexure -VI. It is accordingly pleaded that applicant ought to have been selected ahead of the said M. Karthikayan.

2. On perusal, it is seen that the said M. Karthikayan is not impleaded in this O.A. Further, a mark list showing the marks scored by individual candidates is seen attached as Annexure -VI of the OA from which it is evident that the marks scored by the applicant was 72.50 whereas M. Karthikayan had scored 73.50 out of 100 marks. It is also clear that the weightage for written examination was 85% and final merit list had been prepared by assigning a weightage of 15 marks for Record of Service. The impugned order dated 16.8.2017 indicates that the said M. Karthikayan had scored 13 marks out 15 marks for Record of Service whereas as per Annexure-I communication, applicant had only scored 12 marks out 15 marks. Thus, while the applicant had scored 73.63 out of 100 including Record of Service, M. Karthikayan having secured higher marks both in

written examination as well as Record of Service than the applicant would inevitably be placed above the applicant.

3. In view of the above, the O.A. is frivolous, misconceived and utterly devoid of merits. The applicant seeks to compare the marks secured by him after including the marks for record of service with the marks secured in written examination alone by another candidate to make out a claim which is fallacious. The O.A. is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

(R. RAMANUJAM)
MEMBER(A)

12.3.2018

asvs.