

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW BOMBAY BENCH, NEW BOMBAY

TRANSFERRED APPLICATION No. 169/86

Miss. Shantabai Balkrishna Borkar
Telephone Supervisor
131 Vivekanand Nagar
Khamala Road
Nagpur

Applicant

V/s.

1. The Union of India
through the Director General
P&T Department
Dak-Tar Bhavan
New Delhi
2. The General Manager
Telecommunication
Maharashtra Circle
Bombay
3. The District Manager
Telephones, Nagpur
4. Smt. S. Kriwai
Telephone Supervisor
Trunk Exchange
Nagpur
5. Smt. A.D. Naidu
Telephone Supervisor
Trunk Exchange, Nagpur
6. Smt. N.G. Joshi
Telephone Supervisor
Trunk Exchange, Nagpur
7. Smt. S.A. Nimgade
Telephone Supervisor
Trunk Exchange, Nagpur
8. Shri T.G. Gorghate
Telephone Supervisor
Senior Supervisor Telephone
Exchange, Ulhasnagar,
Dist. Thana

Coram: Hon'ble Member(A) P. Srinivasan
Hon'ble Member(J) M B Mujumdar

Appearance

Shri Y.B. Phadnis
Advocate
for the applicant

ORAL JUDGMENT

Dated: 15.4.1987

(PER: P. Srinivasan, Member(A))

In this application which has been received on
transfer from the High Court ^{M of} at Bombay, Nagpur Bench, the
applicant who is working at present as Telephone Supervisor at
Nagpur complains that she has not been appointed as Junior

R. Srinivasan

Supervisor (10%) a post which carried special pay, though she is entitled ~~to~~ to it by virtue of her seniority.

2. Shri Phadnis contends that the applicant was promoted as Supervisor (20%) on an ad-hoc basis by an order dated 13.9.79 and was selected for regular appointment to that post in a meeting of the D.P.C. held in Janaury 1981. Therefore, her seniority in the grade of Junior Supervisor (20%) should be reckoned from the date on which she assumed charge of the post ⁱⁿ ~~of~~ 1979 on ad ad-hoc basis as she ^{has} ~~has~~ continued in thatpost thereafter till she was approved for that post and regularly appointed in 1981.

3. Mr. S.R. Atre on behalf of respondents 1 to 3 produces records of the meeting of the D.P.C. held on 7/8-1-1981. He points out that in 1976 and 1977, the applicant's case for promotion as Junior Supervisor was considered by a duly constituted DPC and she had been passed over.

4. We have heard counsel for both sides and have perused records produced by respondents 1 to 3. We find that the applicant was indeed passed over for promotion in 1976 and in 1977 by a properly constituted DPC. In the meeting of the DPC held on 7/8/9-1-1981 she was considered and approved for regular appointment ^M ~~as~~ as Junior Supervisor. That meeting was held "to consider the promotion of Telephone Operators to Junior Supervisors and back-date promotion to Junior Supervisors as per D.G.P.&T. No. 45-1-74-SPB-II dated 12.4.1978". Against the name of every official approved for promotion the date from which he or she was ~~was~~ deemed to have been promoted is noted. However, against the name of the

P. S. 