

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**O.A No. 3625 of 2018 with
M.A No. 4029 of 2018**

New Delhi, this the 5th day of April, 2019

**Hon'ble Sh. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Smt. Sushma Kumari,
aged about 61 years,
R/o. D-40, Sudarshan Park,
Moti Nagar, New Delhi.

....Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Pratap Singh)

Versus

1. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
Through its Chairman & Managing Director,
MTNL Corporate Office
Mahanagar Door Sanchar Sadan,
9, C.G.O. Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110 003.
2. The Director (HR)
Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
MTNL Corporate Office
Mahanagar Door Sanchar Sadan,
9, C.G.O. Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110 003.
3. The Executive Director
Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
K. L. Bhawan, Janpath,
New Delhi-110 001.
4. The General Manager (HR)
Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
MTNL Corporate Office
Mahanagar Door Sanchar Sadan,
9, C.G.O. Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110 003.

5. The General Manager (Admin)
Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
K. L. Bhawan, Janpath,
New Delhi – 110 001. ...Respondents

(By Advocate : Mr. Rajive R. Raj)

ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Sh. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)

Heard learned counsel for applicant and Sh. Rajive R. Raj, learned counsel for Union of India, whom this Tribunal directed to state whether the tweets issued by them can be treated as impugned orders or the orders issued by them. Though they were not a party to the O.A, the Union of India represented by Sh. Rajive R. Raj on our direction filed a short reply where under they have categorically stated “interactions done on twitter are generic interactions with *prima facie* replies which cannot be treated as impugned orders.”

2. Since the applicant filed the O.A only basing on certain tweets issued by the respondents MTNL as well as Union of India and in view of the categorical statement by the Union of India in their short reply filed, we cannot examine the validity of those tweets in this O.A. However, since it is the short grievance of the applicant that his representation seeking post retirement promotion vide Annexure A/24 representation dated 02.07.2016, is

unanswered, the O.A is disposed of without going into the merits of the case by directing the respondents MTNL to consider Annexure A/24 representation dated 02.07.2016 of the applicant and to pass appropriate reasoned and speaking order thereon, in accordance with law, within 90 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. If respondents have already passed any orders in respect of the grievance of the applicant, the same may be communicated to the applicant within a reasonable period. However, this order shall not be construed that this Tribunal exempted the applicant from any of the provisions of law including limitation etc. All the pending M.As, if any, stand disposed of. No costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(V. Ajay Kumar)
Member (J)

/Mbt/