

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

Original Application No.21/893/2014

Hyderabad, this the 24th day of February, 2020



***Hon'ble Mr. Justice L Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)***

P. Padmanabhan, Aged about 54 years,
S/o. Sri Siva Ramaiah,
Senior Clerk, Office of the Welfare & Cess Commissioner,
Labour Welfare Organization,
Ministry of Labour & Employment,
Govt. of India, Kendriya Sadan,
Koti, Hyderabad – 500 095.

... Applicant

(By Advocate Mr. T. Koteswara Rao)

Vs.

1. Union of India, Rep. by Secretary,
Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment,
Shram Shakti Bhavan, Rafi Marg,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Director General (Labour & Welfare)
Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment,
Jaisalmer House, Manasingh Road, New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Welfare & Cess Commissioner,
Labour Welfare Organization,
Ministry of Labour & Employment,
Govt. of India, Kendriya Sadan,
Koti, Hyderabad – 500 095.
4. Y. Someswara Rao, Aged about 58 years,
Senior Clerk, Office of the Welfare & Cess Commissioner,
Labour Welfare Organization,
Ministry of Labour & Employment,
Govt. of India, Kendriya Sadan,
Koti, Hyderabad – 500 095.

... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Jose Kollanur, proxy counsel representing
Mr.T. Hanumantha Reddy, Sr. PC for CG &
Sri Y. Someswara Rao, R-4 in person)

ORDER (ORAL)
{As per Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman}

The applicant was working as Senior Clerk in the office of the Welfare and Cess Commissioner, Labour Welfare Organization (LWO), Hyderabad in the year 2014. Consequent upon bifurcation of the Hyderabad Region and creation of another Region of Tirunelveli, an order was passed on 31.07.2014 transferring 4 employees of LWO from Hyderabad to Tirunelveli. The applicant is one of them. He filed the OA challenging the order of transfer.

2. The applicant contends that there are several officers, who had longer

standing at Hyderabad and keeping them aside, he was chosen for transfer.

Other grounds were also urged. This Tribunal passed an interim order way back on 08.08.2014.

3. The respondents filed a counter affidavit opposing the OA.

According to them, the transfers were effected as a consequence of creation of new Region and various other contentions raised by the applicant are not borne out by record.

4. The OA was listed today and there is no representation for the

applicant. Since it is one of the oldest cases, wherein the order of stay is

operating, we have perused the records as contemplated under Rule 15 of

the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987.



5. We heard Mr. Jose Kollanur, learned proxy counsel representing Mr.T. Hanumantha Reddy, learned Senior Panel Counsel for the respondents.



6. The applicant and 3 other employees were transferred on account of creation of a new Region. Whatever may have been the inconvenience faced by the applicant in the year 2014, the same does not remain, at this stage. Nearly 6 years have elapsed. By this time, the applicant might have retired from service. Even otherwise, we do not find any merit in the OA and the same is accordingly dismissed. The interim order is vacated.

7. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

(JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN

evr