

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JANUARY, 1987

Present: Hon'ble Shri Ch.Ramakrishna Rao Member(J)

Hon'ble Shri L.H.A.Rao Member(A)

APPLICATION NO 1598 (C) to (G) 86(F)

1. S.Manikkam Chetty,  
S.S.A., N.S.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam(AP).
2. Adinarayan Rao,  
S.S.A., N.S.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam(AP).
3. K.Danial Prasad,  
S.S.A., N.S.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam(AP).
4. Y.L.Semayajulu,  
S.S.A., N.S.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam(AP).
5. G.Subash Babu,  
S.S.A., N.S.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam(AP).
6. B.J.Raghunath,  
S.S.A., G.T.R.E.,  
P.B.No.7577,  
Bangalore - 75.
7. A.N.Vijayashankar,  
S.S.A., G.T.R.E.,  
P.B.No.7577,  
Bangalore - 75.

... Applicants.

( Shri Ranganatha Jeis

... Advocate )

VS.

1. The Union of India, represented  
by its Secretary, M/o Defence,  
Sena Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Scientific Adviser to Raksha  
Manthri, and Director-General  
Research and Development, South  
Block, Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi - 11.
3. The Director, Recruitment  
Assessment Centre, 225-A, B-Wing,  
Sena Bhavan, Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi - 11.
4. The Director, G.T.R.E.,  
P.B.No. 7577, Bangalore - 75.
5. The Director, NS.T.L.,  
Vishakapatnam, A.P.

... Respondents.

( Shri M.Vasudeva Rao

... Advocate )

These applications came up before us today. Hon'ble Shri L.H.A.Rege, Member(AM) made the following :

O R D E R

Shri Ranganath Jeis, Counsel for the applicants and Shri M.Vasudeva Rao, Counsel for the Respondents present.


2. It has been prayed in these applications that SRO No.159/83 dated 6.5.1983 (Annexure C) stipulating age restriction for in-service candidates, for selection to the post of Scientist 'B', be quashed being arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16(1) of the Constitution. It is further prayed that respondents be directed to consider the claim of the applicants and other similarly situated like them, to upgrade the posts held by them to that of Scientist 'B'.

3. Counsel for the applicants submits that the applications before us are alike in facts and circumstances and the question of law involved, to Application No.5/85(T) <sup>also to</sup> which was disposed of by us earlier on 30.9.1986 and prays that a similar order as passed in that Application, be passed in these applications as well. The order passed by us in Application No. 5/85(T) reads as under,

" The grievance of the applicants is not altogether devoid of substance. We, therefore, direct the respondents to examine the points raised by the applicants in their application/W.R. within two months from the receipt of this order passed by us. The applicants are at liberty to move this Bench again if they are aggrieved by the action/decision of the respondents. The application is disposed of accordingly".

4. We have ascertained that the Applications before us are analogous in point of law and facts, to Application No.5/85(T) disposed of by us earlier. We therefore direct that the Order passed by us in Application No.5/85(T) will also apply to these applications before us mutatis mutandis. These applications are disposed of accordingly.

  
MEMBER(J)

  
MEMBER(AM)(R) 30.1.1987

AN.