

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

Original Application No.20/253/2018

Hyderabad, this the 22nd day of January, 2020



***Hon'ble Mr. Ashish Kalia, Member (Judl.)*
*Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)***

P. Ramu Naidu, S/o. Papa Naidu, Aged 36 years,
Occ: Commercial Inspector (Group C)
O/o. The Senior Divisional Commercial Manager,
South Central Railway, Guntur Division,
Guntur – 522 006, AP.

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr. K.R.K.V. Prasad)

Vs.

1. Union of India, Rep. by the Chairman,
Ministry of Railways,
Railway Board, Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, South Central Railway,
Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad.
3. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
South Central Railway, Guntur division, Guntur.
4. P. Yogaiah, Occ: Chief Commercial Inspector,
South Central Railway, Narsaraopet RS,
Guntur District.
5. Ch. Nageswara Rao,
Occ: Commercial Superintendent,
O/o. The Station Superintendent,
South Central Railway, Repalle RS,
Guntur District. .

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Sri N. Srinatha Rao, SC for Railways)

ORAL ORDER
{As per B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)}



2. The applicant was appointed as Commercial Apprentice in the Guntur Division of South Central Railway in pay scale of Rs.5500-9000 (V CPC) in the pre-merged scenario. After the merger of the scales of Rs.5000-8000 and Rs.5500-9000, the applicant was placed below the persons who were appointed in the grade of Rs.5000-8000. Some persons were also promoted from the grade of Rs.5000-8000 to the grade of Rs.5500-9000 and the applicant was placed below those persons, though the applicant was initially appointed to the grade of Rs.5500-9000. Seniority was published placing the name of the applicant in the merged scale, wrongly applying the instructions vide RBE No.107/2012. Applicant submitted representation by referring the seniority protection given to the similarly appointed Commercial Apprentices in other Divisions of South Central Railway as per the merged grades by placing their names above the employees who were appointed to the grade of Rs.5000-8000. However, the impugned letter dated 05.02.2018 was issued rejecting the claim of the applicant.

3. The matter was heard at length. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the same issue was dealt with by this Tribunal in OA 1842/2015 & 1844/2015, wherein the relief sought for by the applicant was granted. However, the matter was carried over to the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh, wherein, vide order dt. 02.04.2019 in I.A. No. 1 of 2019 in WP No. 4507 of 2019, it was observed as under:

“The contention that the sixth CPC recommendations were accepted on 04.09.2008 retrospectively from 01.01.2006 and in that view of the matter, the instructions specified in sub-para 3 of para-2 of RBE No. 107/2012 are sustainable requires detailed examination.

Hence, there shall be an interim suspension, as prayed for, until further orders.”



4. In view of the above developments, it would be appropriate and fair to direct the applicant to pursue the appropriate remedies, if they so desire, after the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in WP No. 4507/2019 is rendered.
5. With the above directions, the OA is disposed of. No order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

(ASHISH KALIA)
MEMBER (JUDL.)

/evr/