

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD  
BENCH : AT HYDERABAD :

O.A.No.360/87.

Date of Order:29-11-89.

A.Krishna Rao

...Applicant

Versus

The Director General,  
Telecom & 3 others.

...Respondents

-----

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri C.Suryanarayana

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri P.Ramakrishna Raju

-----

CORAM:

HONOURABLE SHRI B.N.JAYASIMHA : VICE CHAIRMAN

HONOURABLE SHRI D.SURYA RAO : MEMBER (JUDL) (I)

-----

The applicant herein is an employee of the Telecom Department <sup>who</sup> seeks to question the order No.TA/STB/13-7/Krishna Rao dated 6-8-86, wherein he was informed that he cannot be posted as an Observation Supervisor. The applicant states that initially he was recruited as a Telephone Operator. He appeared for an examination for recruitment as Observation Supervisor in the year 1983. He was among the 10 persons selected for recruitment. His rank was in the No.9 in the select list. Consequently he was promoted as Observation Supervisor and joined as such on 21-5-84 at Karimnagar. Shortly thereafter, <sup>the 2nd respondent issued</sup> ~~by~~ an order No.TA/STB/15-3/84 dated 28-6-84, <sup>whereby</sup> it was ~~directed~~ <sup>directed</sup> to keep the earlier order of the appointment dt.28-4-84 in obedience,

*hvt*

To:

1. The Director General, Telecommunications (representing Union of India) Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi-110 001.
2. The General Manager, Telecommunications, A.P..Hyderabad-500 001.
3. The Telecom, distt. Engineer, Karimnagar-505 001.
4. The Telecom, Distt Engineer, Guntur-522 050.
5. One copy to Mr.C.Suryanarayana, Advocate, 1-2-583/50 Srinilayam, Sri Sri Marg, Gagan Mahal, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr.P.Ramakrishna Raju, Sr.CGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One spare copy.

...

kj.

P-32  
L  
m

9/8  
5/12/81

.. 2 ..

The reason being the posts <sup>were</sup> ~~are not~~ <sup>to be</sup> filled-up while a ban in force. Despite these orders, the applicant contends that he continued and discharged his duties as Observation Supervisor till his transfer to Tenali in ~~the~~ May, 1986. He contends that subsequently 7 others who were promoted as observation supervisor along with him were continuing as such or given back their promotion, whereas the same benefit was not given to him. <sup>It is contended that as long as he</sup> ~~although he has to~~ functioned as Observation Supervisor, <sup>he was entitled to an allowance of</sup> ~~the benefit of~~ Rs.35/- per month but the same allowance <sup>has</sup> been denied to him. He therefore filed this application.

2. Respondents <sup>have</sup> produced the records. We have heard Shri C.Suryanarayana and Shri Parameshwar Rao, Advocate for Shri P.Ramakrishna Raju, Senior Central Government Standing Counsel. <sup>The</sup> Records disclose that ~~he~~ although the applicant has been reverted as Telephone- Supervisor, so long as the applicant discharged the duties of Observation Supervisor, he would be entitled to the special pay of Rs. 35/-. From the record placed before us, we are unable to say the exact period when the applicant was asked to perform the duties of Observation Supervisor ~~from~~ in between 28-6-84 to 19-6-86. The department should verify <sup>the matter</sup> /and for the period <sup>he was</sup> asked to work as Observation Supervisor he should <sup>be paid</sup> pay him the allowance of Rs.35/- per month. This shall be ~~shall be~~ done with a period of two months. The application is allowed to the extent indicated above <sup>but with</sup> ~~and~~ no costs.

*B.N. Jayasimha*  
(B.N. JAYASIMHA)

*D. Surya Rao*  
(D. SURYA RAO)

AVL.

Dt. 29th November, 1989.  
Dictated in open court

*[Signature]*  
Deputy Registrar