

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**OA/310/00620/2015**

**Dated Friday the 6<sup>th</sup> day of April Two Thousand Eighteen**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE SMT. B. BHAMATHI, Member (A)**

K.Ganesan,  
S/o. Late Kalidoss,  
Warrant Officer (No. 8376645-M),  
2/273, North Street,  
Village & Post – Praiyur,  
Kamuthi Taluk,  
Ramanathapuram District 623708. ....Applicant

By Advocate M/s. K.C.Ramalingam

Vs

- 1.The Addl. Director General,  
Army Postal Service,  
C/o. 56 APO, New Delhi 110056.
- 2.The Chief Record Officer,  
Army Postal Service,  
C/o. 56 APO, New Delhi 110056.
- 3.The Principal Chief Post Master General,  
TN Circle, Anna Salai,  
Chennai 600002.
- 4.The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Virudhunagar Division,  
Virudhunagar 626001. ....Respondents

By Advocate Ms. Shakila Anand

**ORAL ORDER**

**(Pronounced by Hon'ble Smt. B. Bhamathi, Member(A))**

The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following relief:

- “i. To call for the records of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent pertaining to his orders in letter no. 5210/1/APS-1 dated 22.01.2014 and set aside the same, consequent to*
- ii. direct the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents to discharge the applicant as warrant officer and repatriate him in the postal division of the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent,*
- iii. to pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.”*

2. On perusal, it is seen that on 02.01.2018 when the case was called for hearing, there was no representation for the applicant and the matter was directed to be listed before the Registrar Court on 06.03.2018 for completion of pleadings and before Bench on 06.04.2018. When the case came up before the Registrar Court on 06.03.2018 and 28.03.2018, there was no representation for the applicant. Accordingly, the matter was listed today before the Bench. Today also, when the case was called for hearing, neither the applicant nor his counsel was represented.

3. In view of the above, it is evident that the applicant is not interested in prosecuting his case. Accordingly, OA is dismissed for default.

**(B. Bhamathi)**  
**Member(A)**  
**06.04.2018**

SKSI