

16

Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

R.P.No.50/90

IN
O.A.No.319/89.

Date of Decision : 20.8.90.

---T.A.No---

B.Sarada Devi & another Petitioner.

Shri T.Jayant. Advocate Advocate for the
petitioner (s)

Versus

Union of India, represented by the Respondent.
Secretary, Ministry of Communications,

New Delhi & 3 others
Shri Naram Bhaskara Rao, Addl. CGSC Advocate for the
Respondent (s)

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. J.Narasimha Murthy : Member(Judl).

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

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter 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)
- MO

HJNM
M(J)

HRBS
M(A)

17

REVIEW PETITION No.50/90

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.319/89

JUDGMENT OF THE DIVISION BENCH DELIVERED BY HON'BLE
SHRI R.BALASUBRAMANIAN, MEMBER (ADMN).

This petition seeking review of the judgment in O.A.No.319/89 has been filed by Smt. B.Sarada Devi and B.Sasikala against the Union of India, represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Communications, New Delhi and 3 others under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987. The applicants herein are the same as in O.A.No.319/89. The judgment in the O.A. was delivered on 17.4.90 and the review petition has been filed on 15.6.90. The applicants while filing M.A.No.308/90 have stated that due to late receipt of the judgment in Vizianagaram they could not file the review petition in time and have requested for condonation of the delay. The delay is condoned and the ^{M.A.} ~~review petition~~ is disposed of.

2. The main ground on which the applicants seek revision of the judgment in the O.A. is that they had ~~to~~ put in more than 120 days of service as on the last day of the recruitment half ^{year} and that this meets the requirements of the Director-General, Posts & Telegraphs, New Delhi's letter dated 28.12.71 (A-6 of the O.A.). The applicants rely on the judgment of this Tribunal in O.A.No.225/86. The main question is what should be the outer limit of the six months recruitment period? Is it the day when the Department completes recruitment for the corresponding half year of recruitment or is it the last day of the

P1/24 12/2

calendar for the corresponding half year of recruitment;

Six weeks notice may therefore be given to the respondents and the case taken up for hearing thereafter.

MS
(J.NARASIMHA MURTHY)
Member(Judl).

R. Balasubramanian
(R.BALASUBRAMANIAN)
Member(Admn).

22
Dated 20.8.90

S. Srinivasan
for Deputy Registrar(Judl)

To

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Communications, Union of India, New Delhi.
2. The Postmaster General, Andhra Circle, Hyderabad - 1.
3. The Director of Postal Services, A.P. North Eastern Region, Visakhapatnam - 20.
4. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Vizianagaram Division, Vizianagaram - 202.
5. One copy to Mr. T. Jayant, Advocate 17-35 B, Srinagar Colony, Gaddiannaram, Dilsukhnagar, P&T Colony P.O. Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. N. Bhaskara Rao, Addl. C.S.C. CAT. Hyd. Bench.
7. One spare copy.

P. S. Rao
pvm.