

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NOS:55/1999  
AND 56/1999  
DATED THE 25TH DAY OF OCT, 2002**

**CORAM:HON'BLE SHRI S.L.JAIN, MEMBER(J)  
HON'BLE SMT. SHANTA SHAstry, MEMBER(A)**

Shri R.P.More,  
Aged 50 years, Master Craftsman,  
under D.E.E.,(TD) Kurla and  
residing at C/o.Fazal Khudad Khan,  
Ashok Nagar, Masjid Chawl,  
Kalyan Depot, Kalyan, Thane-Dist.      ... Applicant in OA  
No.55/1999.

Shri Ram Raksha,  
Aged 45 years, Master Craftsman,  
under D.E.E.(TD) Kurla and  
residing at MS/RB/I/III/9,  
Central Railway, Kurla (East),  
Mumbai - 400 024.      ... Applicant in OA  
No.56/1999.

By Advocate Shri L.M.Nerlekar

V/s.

1. Union of India,  
(Through Central Railway),  
D.R.M., C.S.T., Mumbai.
2. Divisional Electrical Engineer,  
(TD) Central Railway, Kurla.
3. Shri Gautam Bhiva,  
Maintainer Grade-I,  
under D.E.E., (TD) Kurla.
4. Shri C.T.Mathai,  
Maintainer Grade-I,  
under D.E.E.(TD), Kurla.
5. Shri A.G.Ghogale,  
Maintainer Grade-I,  
under D.E.E. (TD), Kalyan
6. Shri Bhanudas Jagannath,  
Maintainer Grade-I,  
under D.E.E., (TD), Kurla  
under D.E.E. (TD), Kalyan
7. Shri Ramkaran R Yadav,  
Maintainer Grade-I,  
under D.E.E. (TD), Kurla.

Respondents in both  
OA Nos.55/99 and 56/99

By Advocate Shri Suresh Kumar

P.18XW/

...2.

(ORAL)(ORDER)

Per Shri S.L.Jain, Member(J)

This is an application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act 1985 for the declaration that the seniority list published vide letter dated 13/5/1997 (Exhibit A), is incorrect, be treated as cancelled with direction to the respondents to recast~~s~~ the seniority of the applicants in accordance with the directions of the Tribunal in OA Nos.755/1991 and 302/1992. They have further sought to declaration <sup>to</sup> the effect that the applicants who have qualified in the written test and appeared for viva voce shall be interpolated in the list of Chargeman 'B' at appropriate place in the panel published on 9/10/1991 with consequential proforma fixation of pay and arrears of wages and allowances.

2. The applicants who<sup>were</sup> were recruited as Linesman were promoted to the post of FTR-HSK Grade II and thereafter FTR-HSK I. The applicant had no channel of promotion to the cadre of Maintainer. As such the claim of the applicants is devoid of merit. It is liable to be rejected.

3. In the result, both the OAs deserve\$ to be dismissed and are dismissed accordingly with no orders as to costs.

*Shanta*  
(SMT. SHANTA SHASTRY)  
MEMBER(A)

*S.L.Jain*  
(S.L.JAIN)  
MEMBER(J)

abb