

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHENNAI BENCH**

**MA/310/00418/2018 in & OA/310/01009/2018**

**Dated Monday the 30<sup>th</sup> day of July Two Thousand Eighteen**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, Member (A)**

**&**

**HON'BLE MR. P. MADHAVAN, Member (J)**

N.Sudalaimani,  
Assistant Loco Pilot,  
Madurai.

....Applicant

By Advocate M/s. R. Pandian

Vs

Union of India rep by,  
1.The General Manager,  
Southern Railway,  
Park Town, Chennai 600003.

2.The Chief Personnel Officer,  
Southern Railway,  
Park Town, Chennai 600003.

3.The Divisional Personnel Officer,  
Southern Railway,  
Madurai Division, Madurai 625010.

4.The Divisional Personnel Officer,  
Southern Railway,  
Tiruchirapalli Division,  
Tiruchirapalli 620001.

....Respondents

By Advocate Mr. P. Srinivasan

**ORAL ORDER**

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

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

"To call for the records relating to the Inter-Divisional Railway One Way Request Transfer of the applicant from Tiruchirapalli Division to Madurai Division of Southern Railway and the consequent fixation of seniority vide the impugned order in No. U/P.676/VI/Mechl.Rg. dated 14.11.2016, to quash the impugned order and further:-

i. To direct the 3rd respondent to recast the seniority list of the cadre of Assistant Loco Pilots by placing the applicant whose Inter-Railway One Way Request Transfer was approved by the competent authority on 14.05.2015 above Mr. Mahendra Kumar Meena (Sl. No. 21), who joined the seniority unit on 19.11.2015 through Railway Recruitment Board and

ii. To pass such other order/orders as this Tribunal may deem fit and proper and thus to render justice. "

2. It is submitted that the applicant is identically placed as one S. Ganesan who approached this Tribunal with a similar grievance in OA 492/2018 which was disposed of by this Tribunal on 13.04.2018 with a direction to the competent authority to consider the representation of the applicant therein in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order. The applicant would be satisfied if a similar order is passed in this case.

3. Mr. P. Srinivasan takes notice for the respondents.

4. Keeping in view the limited relief urged and without going into the substantive merits of the case, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondents to consider Annexure A8 representation of the applicant

dt. 22.12.2016 in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. OA is disposed of with the above directions. Consequently MA for condonation of delay stands disposed of.

**(P. Madhavan)**  
**Member(J)**

**(R.Ramanujam)**  
**Member(A)**

**30.07.2018**

SKSI