

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex(BDA),
Indiranagar,
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 16/9/87

Application No. 2063 /86(F)

W.P. No. 1

Applicant

Shri R.A. Hattiholi

V/s The GM, South Central Railway,
& another

To

1. Shri R.A. Hattiholi
Complaints Inspector
Divisional Railway Manager's Office
General Branch
Hubli

4. The Chief Personnel Officer
South Central Railway
Secunderabad

2. Shri S.R. Bannurmath
Advocate
57, Laxmi Nivas
5th Cross, Vasanthanagar
Bangalore - 560 052

5. Shri M. Sreerangaiah
Railway Advocate
3, S.P. Buildings, 10th Cross
Cubbonpet Main Road
Bangalore - 560 002

3. The General Manager
South Central Railway
Rail Nilayam
Secunderabad (A.P.)

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH IN
APPLICATION NO. 2063/86(F)

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order/Annexure

passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on 4-9-87.

By [Signature]
Deputy Registrar
EXXONXOKKINERX
(JUDICIAL)

Encl : as above.

Balu*

9c.

RECEIVED (5 Oct 1987)
Diary No 1152 (CRIS)
Date: 18/9/87

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1987

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman
and
Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan, Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 2063/1986

Shri R.A. Hattiholi,
S/o A.R. Hattiholi,
complaints Inspector,
DRMS Office,
General Branch,
Hubli.

.... Applicant

(Shri S.R. Bannurmath, advocate)

v.

1. The General Manager,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad.

.... Respondents.

(Shri M. Sreerangaiah, Advocate)

This application having come up for hearing to-day,
Shri P. Srinivasan, Member (A) made the following:

O R D E R

This application was posted for hearing to-day. But, the applicant and his learned counsl are not present, though the matter was called several times during the whole day. We find that the applicant and his learned counsel were not present on several earlier occasions also starting from 10.3.1987 till to-day. We have, therefore, decided to proceed to deal with the application with the assistance of Sri Sreerangaiah, learned counsel for the respondents.

P. S. Srinivasan

2. The grievance of the applicant in this application is that though he had been working for some time as Complaints Inspector ('CI') at Hubli, on ad-hoc basis, he was not regularly appointed to that post and that on the regular appointment of a certain Muralidharan to that post, he was reverted to his original post of Station Master.

3. Sri Sreerangaiah, explains to us that the post of Station Master in which the applicant was actually fitted by an order passed as early as on 18.6.1984 carried a higher scale of pay than that of CI, which the applicant was holding on an ad-hoc basis. This order could not be implemented till 1987 for some reason or the other. However, when a regular appointment was made to the post of CI in the person of Sri Muralidharan, the applicant had naturally to be relieved of that post. By having been relieved from that post and appointed as Station Master, the applicant had actually gone to a post carrying higher pay scale and so he can have no grievance. We are satisfied that the applicant can have no grievance whatsoever. In the first place, he was appointed as CI only on an ad-hoc basis and in the second place the post to which he was reverted was a higher post than that of CI. Therefore, the application is dismissed as devoid of any merit. Parties to bear their own costs.

- True Copy -

Sd/-

Vice-Chairman

4/9/87

R. Venkatesh
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

Sd/-

Member (A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ADDITIONAL BENCH np/Mrv.
BANGALORE