

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD



OA/021/00045/2014  
Date of Order : 20-11-2019

Between :

P.Sivaisingh S/o Sri P.Fakeera,  
Aged about 46 years, Occ : Turner/MCM,  
LMS Section, Ordnance Factory, Medak-502 205,  
R/o Q.No.314, Ordnance Factory Yeddumailaram,  
Sangareddy Mandal, Medak District,  
PIN 502 205.

....Applicant

And

1. Union of India represented by its  
Director General and Chairman, Ordnance Factory Board,  
Government of India, Ministry of Defence,  
10-A, S.K.Bose Road, Kolkatta-700001.

2. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory,  
Ministry of Defence, Yeddumilaram Post,  
Medak Dist – PIN 502 205, A.P.

....Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. K. Ram Murthy

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr.K.Rajitha, Sr.CGSC

-- -- --

OA/021/00045/2014

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. S.N.TERDAL : JUDICIAL MEMBER

THE HON'BLE MR.NAINI JAYASEELAN: ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER



(Oral Order per Hon'ble Mr.S.N.Terdal,Judicial Member)

-----

Heard Mr. K. Ram Murthy, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs. K. Rajitha, learned Senior Central Govt., Standing Counsel for Respondents.

2. The relief prayed for in the OA is as follows :

“In view of the facts stated above, the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to call for the records pertaining to the Impugned Factory Order No.120263, dated 21.5.2012 and No.07/034/LB dated : 23.7.2012 issued by 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent and declare the same as arbitrary, illegal, discriminatory, unjust, violation of Article 14, 16, 311 (2) Rules made under proviso of Article 309 of the Constitution of India, against principles of Natural Justice and set aside and quash.”

3. At the time of hearing, we noticed that after impugned order dated 23.7.2012, the applicant made another representation. With reference to the said representation, the Respondents passed a speaking order

OA/021/00045/2014

Produced as Annexure R-14 to the reply statement and the same was

also served on the applicant.



4. Hence the present OA has become infructuous. If the applicant is aggrieved by the order served on him i.e Annexure R-14 to the reply statement, he is at liberty to challenge the same.

5. Accordingly the O.A. is disposed of as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

(NAINI JAYASEELAN)  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

(S.N.TERDAL)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER

Dated : 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2019.  
Dictated in Open Court.

vl.