

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Thursday 25th day of April Two Thousand And Nineteen

PRESENT:

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

OA. 586 of 2019

C. Rajarajeshwari,
Postal Assistant,
Chennai G.P.O.,
Chennai- 600 001.

...Applicant

(By Advocate: M/s.M. Vivekanandan)

Versus

1. Director General,
Department of Posts,
New Delhi- 110 001;
2. The Chief Postmaster General,
Tamil Nadu Circle,
Chennai- 600 002;
3. The Postmaster General,
Chennai City Region,
Chennai- 600 002;
4. The Chief Postmaster,
Chennai G.P.O.,
Chennai- 600 001.

...Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Su. Srinivasan)

ORAL ORDER

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

The applicant has filed this OA seeking the following relief:-

"to direct the respondent to dispose the applicant's representation on 07.08.2018 and consider her for seniority and consequential benefit from the date she joined as Postal Assistant under RTP scheme and pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice."

2. When the matter is taken up, learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant had made a representation dated 07.08.2018 with regard to her grievance which had failed to evoke a response from the respondents till date. He accordingly urges that the pending representation of the applicant may be directed to be considered by the competent authority within a time limit to be set by the Tribunal.
3. Mr. Su. Srinivasan, Learned Central Government Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents takes notice for the respondents and submits that he had no objection to the prayer.
4. Keeping in view the limited relief urged and the fact that the representation of the applicant is still pending before the authorities, I deem it appropriate to direct the competent authority to consider the aforesaid representation in accordance with law and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. OA is disposed of at the admission stage with the aforesaid direction without going into the substantive merits of the case. No costs