

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/17TH BHADRA, 1937

O.P.No.3143 of 2001 (Y)

PETITIONER(S):-

SATHEISH B.NAIR,
PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER,
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING & RESEARCH CENTRE,
KOCHI.

BY ADV.SRI.BENNY P.THOMAS.

RESPONDENT(S):-

1. THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING & RESEARCH CENTRE (NATPAC),
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR,
SHASTRA BHAVAN, PATTAM PALACE POST,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 004.
2. MR. U.J.PHILIPOSE,
PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR, NATPAC, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
3. MR.G.C.DASGUPTA,
PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR, NATPAC, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
4. MR. M.C.RAJEEVAN,
PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR, NATPAC, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
5. DR. G.RAVIKUMAR,
PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR, NATPAC, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.R.KRISHNA RAJ.

THIS ORIGINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
08-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:-

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- | | |
|--------|--|
| EXT.P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER OF APPOINTMENT ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER. |
| EXT.P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE CONFIRMATION LETTER AS THE PETITIONER'S SERVICES WAS CONFIRMED W.E.F. 2.12.87 BY ORDER DATED 28.3.88. |
| EXT.P3 | TRUE COPY OF THE PROMOTION POLICY'S RELEVANT EXTRACT. |
| EXT.P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 5.9.91 PROMOTING THE PETITIONER AS SENIOR RESEARCH OFFICER WITH EFFECT FROM 2.12.88. |
| EXT.P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 7.7.99 PROMOTING THE PETITIONER AS PRINCIPAL RESEARCH OFFICER W.E.F.1.12.95. |
| EXT.P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 8.1.2001 SENT BY THE PETITIONER. |
| EXT.P7 | TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SENT BY THE RESPONDENT INSTITUTION. |

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:-

NIL.

Vku/-

[true copy]

K. Vinod Chandran, J

O.P.No.3143 of 2001-Y

Dated this the 08th day of September, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has filed the above writ petition against Exhibit P7 order of the 1st respondent, which refused to consider the petitioner for promotion, since on an evaluation of his performance, he was found to have not improved the performance making him eligible for further promotion. The learned counsel for the 1st respondent would also submit that the respondents 2 to 5 were admittedly seniors to the petitioners. In any event, the assessment of the petitioner having not shown any improvement in performance vide Exhibit P7, there can be no defect in the petitioner not being considered for promotion.

The writ petition would stand dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

K.Vinod Chandran
Judge.

vku/-

[true copy]