

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Thursday 27th day of September Two Thousand And Eighteen

PRESENT:

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

M.A./310/542/2018

in

O.A./310/1279/2018

&

O.A./310/1279/2018

1. T.N. Nithya,
Thalatheru (Post) Karaikal;
2. S. Kumaraguru,
Madhagadi, Karaikal;
3. R. Stalin,
Lawspet, Puducherry;
4. P. Santhya,
Puducherry;
5. A. Amit Ashok Kumar Patel,
Puducherry;
6. K.Muthumalar,
Karaikal;
7. K. Thanigaikoumarane,
Puducherry;
8. A. Radakichanin,
Puducherry;
9. V. Sreeja,
Gorimedu;
10. P. Balakrishnan,
Puducherry;
11. S. Ramadoss,
Puducherry.

.....Applicants/Applicants

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

VS.

1. Union of India Rep. by
Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
Chief Secretariat,
Puducherry- 605 001;
2. Director of School Education,
Government of Puducherry,
100 feet Road, Annanagar,
Puducherry- 605 005.

... ..Respondents /Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. R. Syed Mustafa)

ORAL ORDER

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

M.A. 542 of 2018 has been filed by the applicants seeking permission to join together, alleging that the cause of action and relief sought by them are one and same.

2. Heard and gone through the affidavit filed in support of the M.A. MA is allowed. Applicants are permitted to join together and file a single OA.

3. This O.A has been filed by the applicants seeking the following reliefs:-

“to issue a direction to the respondents to consider the representation dated 27.08.2018 of the applicants and to pass orders in the matter of the release of Select List for the post of Lecturers (Physical Education) in respect of the Notification dated 09.06.2014 and issue of appointment to the applicants within a reasonable time limit that may be fixed by this Hon’ble Tribunal.”

4. It is submitted that the applicants were aggrieved that inspite of being selected for appointment to the post of Lecturer (Physical Education) in pursuance of the Employment Notification dated 09.06.2014, they had not been issued with the appointment letters. It is submitted that initially some the existing staff of the respondents’ organization challenged the notification in O.A. 1111/2014 which was dismissed by an order dated 30.04.2015. Thereafter, two candidates in the wait list filed O.As No.965 and 1614/2015 wherein the respondents were directed to consider finalizing the select list after taking into account their plea.

5. The Government of Puducherry challenged the order of the Tribunal in the aforesaid case and the Hon'ble Madras High Court set aside the order. The Hon'ble High Court also directed the authorities to release the select list and wait list and granted liberty to the applicants herein to challenge the same after its publication. The matter was disposed of by the Hon'ble Madras High Court by an order passed on 2.3.2017. However, the respondents have still not released the select list and made the appointments, it is alleged.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicants had made Annexure-A/8 representation dated 27.08.2018 in this regard to the competent authority seeking appointment orders which is still pending with the respondents. Accordingly, the applicants would be satisfied if the competent authority is directed to consider the representation and pass a reasoned and speaking order within time limit to be set by the Tribunal.

7. Keeping in view the limited relief sought and without going into the substantive merits of the case, the competent authority is directed to consider Annexure A/8 representation of the applicants dated 27.08.2018 in accordance with law and the relevant recruitment rules and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(R. RAMANUJAM)
MEMBER(A)

asvs.

27.09.2018