

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH
 R.P.No. 2/93
 in
 D.A.No. 445/89.

T.A. No.

Dt. of Decision:

Rafiuddin Khan & 6 others

Petitioner

Shri K.S.R. Anjaneyulu

Advocate for
the Petitioner
(s)

Versus

Union of India, Rep. by the Secy., to Govt., &
Director-General, Dept. of Telecommunications, Respondent.
New Delhi & another

Shri N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC

Advocate for
the Respondent
(s)

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. Balasubramanian : Member (A)

THE HON'BLE MR. C.J. Roy : Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?
5. Remarks of Vice-Chairman on Columns 1, 2, 4 (to be submitted to Hon'ble Vice-Chairman where he is not on the Bench.)

av1/

HRBS
M(A). HCJR
M(J).

(23)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

R.P.No.2/93 in
O.A.No.445/89.

Date of Order : 11-1-1993

1. Rafiuddin Khan
2. Mohd. Ejaz Ahmed
3. Mohd. Fakruddin
4. K.Venkateswara Rao
5. M.Vijaya Kumar
6. B.Rajaiah
7. Smt. M.S.Chandra .. Applicants

Vs.

Union of India, Rep. by

1. The Secy., to Govt., &
Director-General,
Dept. of Telecommunications,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom., A.P.Circle,
Hyderabad-1. .. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri K.S.R.Anjaneyulu

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian : Member(A)

Hon'ble Shri C.J.Roy : Member(J)

X Order of the Division Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri
C.J.Roy : Member(J) X

(In circulation).

This R.P. is filed with a prayer to review the judgement
dt. 16.10.92 in the O.A.

2. The R.P. applicants claim that the decision of this Bench
to restrict the arrears to the period after 13.6.88 is an error
apparent on the ground that other Benches had granted arrears
to their applicants from 16.11.78. What this Bench decided was
to extend the main benefit of the judgement of the other Benches
to the applicants before us without overlooking the limitation
aspect regarding arrears which is a consequence of the main
benefit viz: the grant of scale which in any case was notional

22

as decided by the other Benches and followed by us. The applicants are similar to the ones before the other Benches but are not identically placed when it comes to the point of time ^{in which} when legal redressal was sought. Hence the laches on their part cannot be lost sight of. The R.P. is therefore dismissed with no order as to costs.

R.Balasubramanian

(R.Balasubramanian)

Member (A).

C.J.Roy

(C.J.Roy)

Member (J).

8/11/93
Deputy Registrar (J)

1993.