

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD**

**CP/020/62/2018**

**in**

**OA/020/505/2015**

**Dated: 10.01.2019**

Between:

P.V. Satyanarayana,  
S/o. Parthsarathi Rao,  
Aged 49 years,  
Working as Substitute Postman,  
Head Post Office, Machilipatnam,  
Machilipatnam Division, District Krishna.

1 Petitioner

**A N D**

1. The Union of India rep. by  
The Director General, Posts,  
Department of Posts, Dak Sadan,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi -1.
2. Mr. K. Balasubramaniyam,  
The Chief Postmaster General,  
A.P. Circle, Vijayawada.
3. Smt. Alisha, The Postmaster General,  
Vijayawada Region, Vijayawada.
4. Mr. M. Hari Prasad Sharma,  
The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Machilipatnam Division,  
Machilipatnam, District Krishna.
5. Mr. K. Devanand,  
The Inspector of Post Offices,  
Pamarru Sub-Division, Pamarru,  
Machilipatnam Division,  
Machilipatnam, District Krishna.
6. The Inspector of Post Offices,  
Machilipatnam Sub-Division,  
Machilipatnam, District Krishna.
7. Mr. M.N. Reddy, The Head Postmaster,  
Head Post Office, Machilipatnam,  
Machilipatnam Division,  
District Krishna. ... Respondents

(Respondents No.1 & 6 are not necessary parties)

Counsel for the Petitioner : Mrs. Rachna Kumari  
Counsel for the Respondents : Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC

CORAM:

***Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. Kantha Rao, Member (J)***  
***Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (A)***

**ORAL ORDER**  
[Per Hon'ble Mr. Justice R. Kantha Rao, Member (J)]

Heard both the learned counsel.

2. The Tribunal on 16.4.2015 passed the following order in O.A. No.505/2015:

öIn the meantime, by considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the applicant, by way of an interim order, we direct the respondents to continue the applicant as substitute Postman/ Group-D in Head Post Office, Machilipatnam until regular appointment is made.ö

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the order has been violated by appointing a junior of the petitioner. On the other hand, it is submitted by the learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents that since regular appointment was made vide proceedings dated 29.12.2014, there is no contempt in the instant case.

4. Having gone through the submissions made on either side, we are of the view that there is no contempt and hence, the Contempt Petition is closed.

**(B.V. SUDHAKAR)**  
**MEMBER (A)**

**(JUSTICE R. KANTHA RAO)**  
**MEMBER (J)**