

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

O.A.No.162/2001

Wednesday this the 14th day of February, 2001

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. T.N.T. NAYAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. P.D.Babu, S/o Devasiya,
Temporary Status Casual Mazdoor,
Periyaram Telephone Exchange,
Chalakudy, Thrissur,
residing at Plackal Veedu,
Nayarangudi, Kodasseri PO,
Periyaram.
2. P.V.Vinodan, S/o Velu,
Temporary Status Casual Mazdoor,
Punnayoorkulam Sub Division,
Thrissur,
residing at Pandalongattil
Kumbalangadu, Kanjarkode,
Vadakkancherry.
3. C.K.Mohan, S/o Kesavan C.P.
Temporary Status Casual Mazdoor,
Guruvayoor Sub Division,
Thrissur,
residing at Chellaril House,
Kanjarkode, Kumbalangadu,
Vadakkancherry.Applicants

(By Advocate Mr. Vassichan Chempazhanthiyil (rep.)
V.

1. General Manager, Telecom
Thrissur SSA Unit,
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.
Thrissur.
2. Chief General Manager,
Telecom, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.
Kerala Circle, Thiruvananthapuram.
3. Union of India, rep. by its
Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
New Delhi-110 001.
4. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. rep
by its Chairman, New Delhi.l.Respondents

(By Advocate Smt.S.Chitra)

The application having been heard on 14-2-2001 the
Tribunal on the same day delivered the following:

Contd....

O R D E R

HON'BLE MR. A.V. HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

The applicants 1 to 3 who are Temporary Status Casual Mazdoors are aggrieved that their names have not been included within the 31 names of persons to be regularised by Annexure.A3 order. It is stated that persons with lesser length of service have been included in the list and that there is no justification for leaving them out. With these allegations the applicants have filed this application impugning Annexure.A3 to the extent it does not include their names and for a direction to the respondents to absorb them on Group D posts including their name in Annexure.A3.

2. The applicants have on para 6 of the Original Application stated that they have exhausted all remedies available to them under the relevant service rules. But it is seen that as a matter of fact they have not exhausted any remedy at all. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for applicants submits that the application may be disposed of permitting the applicants to make a joint representation within a short time and directing the second respondent to dispose of the representation giving them a speaking order within a reasonable time. Learned counsel for respondents submits that she has no objection in doing so.

3. In the result, in the light of the submission made by the learned counsel on either side, the application is disposed of permitting the applicants to make a joint and detailed representation within two

contd....

✓

.3.

weeks from today to the second respondent and directing the second respondent that if such a representation is made within the time, the same shall be considered and disposed of by passing a speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the representation. No order as to costs.

Dated the 14th day of February, 2001


T.N.T. NAYAR
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER


A.V. HARIDASAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

S.

List of annexure referred to:

Annexure.A3: True copy of the Memo No.ES/21-4/2000/D dated 16.1.2001 of the 2nd respondent.

...