

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI BENCH**

OA/310/00618/2018

Dated Tuesday the 5th day of June Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

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

P.P.Selvam,
residing at E-1-988, 3rd floor,
40th Cross street, Tiruvalluvar nagar,
Thiruvannamalai, Chennai 600041.Applicant

By Advocate M/s. Balan Haridas

Vs

- 1.Union of India,
rep by its Director General Doordarshan Kendra,
Mandi House, Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi 110001.
- 2.Deputy Director General (E),
Doordarshan Kendra,
No. 5, Swamy Sivanandha Salai,
Chennai 600005.
- 3.Deputy Director (AR) / Admn,
Doordarshan Kendra,
No. 5, Swamy Sivanandha Salai,
Chennai 600005.Respondents

By Advocate Mr. K. Rajendran

ORAL ORDER

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

Heard learned counsel for applicant. The applicant has filed this OA under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 seeking the following reliefs:

“8. i. To quash the order of the 3rd respondent dated 24.11.2017 bearing no. 7(2)2017-All/Che.

ii. Consequently direct the respondents to implement the recommendations of the High Level Committee viz, recommendation No. 26 as approved by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in office memorandum dated 18.02.1994 bearing no. 15/33/93-Admn.IV Vol II part (26) by creating the promotional post “Edit Officer” and consider the applicant for promotion to the post of “Edit Officer”.

iii. Pass such other orders or directions as this Hon'ble Tribunal think fit in the circumstances of the case and render justice.”

2. It is submitted that the applicant joined the respondent organisation on 19.12.1983 as Film/Video Editor. He was promoted to the post of Edit Supervisor on 01.07.2016. It is submitted that the said post of Edit Supervisor has no promotional avenue and there has been a demand for creation for promotional avenue. Accordingly, a committee was constituted and it was recommended that a post of Edit Officer be created. Based on the recommendations, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting issued an OM dt. 18.02.1994 accepting the recommendations in principle. But no further action was taken by the respondents. The applicant made a representation on 07.11.2017 and requested for further action for creation of the post of Edit Officer. On 24.11.2017, he received a reply dated 24.11.2017 rejecting his request stating that the applicant had received

promotion as Edit Supervisor and 1st 2nd and 3rd MACPs had already been granted as per rules. Aggrieved, the applicant has approached this Tribunal.

3. Mr. K. Rajendran takes notice for the respondents.

4. On perusal, it is seen that the order dt. 24.11.2017 rejecting the applicant's request is cryptic and it does not convey the exact reasons for rejection of the applicant's request.

5. In view of the above, without going into the merits of case, I deem it appropriate to direct the 1st respondent to reconsider the representation dt. 07.11.2017 in accordance with law and pass reasoned and speaking orders with regard to consideration of the applicant's claim by amending recruitment rules / creation of posts. In the alternative, decision regarding other options in accordance with law to address the issue of stagnation of the applicant shall be taken and conveyed by way of a speaking order to the applicant. The above exercise shall be completed within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. All issues of law, including delay, if any are kept open.

6. OA is disposed of with the above direction at the admission stage.

(B. Bhamathi)
Member(A)
05.06.2018

SKSI