# IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 61/89. TXXXXXV.

198

DATE OF DECISION 24-6-1992.

M.A.Muqeem & 3 others	_Petitioner
Sri K.S.R.Anjaneyulu	Advocate for the Petitionerts)
Versus	
Union of India, rep. by the  Secretary, Deptt. of Posts, No. & 3 others	Respondent -
Sri N.R.Deva Raj, Addl. CGSC	Advocate for the Respondents

# CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN, MEMBER (A)

C.J. ROY, MEMBER (J) The Hon'ble Mr.

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
- To be referred to the Reporter or not?
- Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?

Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

M (J)

M(A)

MGIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000

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

## 0.A.No. 61/89.

Date of Decision: 24-6-1992

## Between:

- 1. M.A. Mugeem
- P. Laxmi
- 3. B. Rajaiah
- 4. Ch. Narender

Applicants

Vs.

Union of India, represented by:

- The Secretary to Government, Department of Posts, New Delhi.
- The Post Master General, Hyderabad.
- The Director of Postal Services, (Northern Region), Hyderabad.
- The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad.

Respondents

For the applicants

Sri K.S.R. Anjaneyulu, Advocate.

For the respondents

: Sri N.R. Deva Raj, Addl. CGSC.

#### CORAM:

HON'BLE SRI R. BALASUBRAMANIAN, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE SRI C.J. ROY, MEMBER (J)

XJUDGMENT OF THE BENCH AS PER HON BLE SRI R. BALASUBRAMANIAN.

• • • • • •

This application is filed by Sri M.A.Muqeem and 3 others under sec. 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 against the Secretary, Department of Posts, New Delhi and 3 others with the prayer to declare the Memo No.A6-8/Col.-V/88-89 dt. 23-1-1989 of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad as arbitrary and illegal and also for a direction to the respondents

W.

...2.

To

- The Secretary to Govt., Union of India, Dept. of Posts, New Delhi.
- 2. The Post Master General, Hyderabad.
- 3. The Director of Postal Services, (Northern Region), Hyderabad.
- 4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad.
- 5. One copy to Mr.K.S.R.Anjaneyulu, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
- 6. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
- 7. One copy to Hon'ble Mr.C.J.Roy. Member(J)CAT.Hyd.
- 8. One spare copy.

pvm.

Later of States

n re-instate the applicants and absorb them as per Judgments of the Hon ble Supreme Court of India.

- The applicants are permitted to file single O.A. as they are similarly placed. The facts of the case are that the applicants have been working as part-time contingent labour under Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad Division for various durations from January, 1982. By the impugned order dt. 23-1-1989 one post of Farrash Day Watchman at Nizamabad Hq. and one post of Farrash at Kamareddy Hq. and Armoor Hq. were brought under reduction. It is the case of the applicants that based on several decisions of this Bench and also of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they should be considered for regularisation keeping in view the part-time services they had rendered to the department. Not getting favourable reply from the respondents the applicants have filed this O.A.
- The respondents have filed counter affidavit and з. oppose the application. In their counter they have indicated the service put in by the four applicants. It is seen that in all cases, the applicants have put in more than 240 days in a year, and are eligible as such for regularisation. However, for want of posts, the applicants are not regularised. Under these circumstances, we dispose-of the application with a direction to the respondents that as and when the posts in the cadre, of Farrash or equivalent are created, the cases of the applicants also should be considered for regularisation in the order of the number of days of service that they had put in, in the department.
- The application is disposed-of accordingly. no order as to costs.

arh.

Date: 24th day of June, 1992.

(Dictated in Open Court)

TYPEL BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIS - BUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH.

THE HOW BLE MR.

THE HOW BLE MR.R.BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)

THE HON BLE MR.T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY : MEDRER (Ó)

THE HON BLE MR.C.J. ROY : MEMBER(J)

Dated: 24- 6 -1992

ORDER JUDGMENT

R.A./C.A./M.A. No.

61/89 O.A.No.

(W.P. NO.

Admitted and interim directions issued

Allowed

Dismissed

Disposed of with directions

Central Administrative Tribunal DESPATCH

HYDERABAD BENCH.

Dismissed as withdraw

Dismissed for Default. M.A.Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

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

## 0.A.No. 61/89.

Date of Decision: 24-6-1992

## Between:

- 1. M.A. Mugeem
- P. Laxmi
- 3. B. Rajaiah
- 4. Ch. Narender

Applicants

Vs.

Union of India, represented by:

- The Secretary to Government, Department of Posts, New Delhi.
- The Post Master General, Hyderabad.
- The Director of Postal Services, (Northern Region), Hyderabad.
- The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad.

Respondents

For the applicants

Sri K.S.R. Anjaneyulu, Advocate.

For the respondents

: Sri N.R. Deva Raj, Addl. CGSC.

#### CORAM:

HON'BLE SRI R. BALASUBRAMANIAN, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE SRI C.J. ROY, MEMBER (J)

XJUDGMENT OF THE BENCH AS PER HON BLE SRI R. BALASUBRAMANIAN.

• • • • • •

This application is filed by Sri M.A.Muqeem and 3 others under sec. 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 against the Secretary, Department of Posts, New Delhi and 3 others with the prayer to declare the Memo No.A6-8/Col.-V/88-89 dt. 23-1-1989 of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad as arbitrary and illegal and also for a direction to the respondents

W.

...2.

To

- The Secretary to Govt., Union of India, Dept. of Posts, New Delhi.
- 2. The Post Master General, Hyderabad.
- 3. The Director of Postal Services, (Northern Region), Hyderabad.
- 4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad.
- 5. One copy to Mr.K.S.R.Anjaneyulu, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
- 6. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
- 7. One copy to Hon'ble Mr.C.J.Roy. Member(J)CAT.Hyd.
- 8. One spare copy.

pvm.

Later of States

n re-instate the applicants and absorb them as per Judgments of the Hon ble Supreme Court of India.

- The applicants are permitted to file single O.A. as they are similarly placed. The facts of the case are that the applicants have been working as part-time contingent labour under Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad Division for various durations from January, 1982. By the impugned order dt. 23-1-1989 one post of Farrash Day Watchman at Nizamabad Hq. and one post of Farrash at Kamareddy Hq. and Armoor Hq. were brought under reduction. It is the case of the applicants that based on several decisions of this Bench and also of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they should be considered for regularisation keeping in view the part-time services they had rendered to the department. Not getting favourable reply from the respondents the applicants have filed this O.A.
- The respondents have filed counter affidavit and з. oppose the application. In their counter they have indicated the service put in by the four applicants. It is seen that in all cases, the applicants have put in more than 240 days in a year, and are eligible as such for regularisation. However, for want of posts, the applicants are not regularised. Under these circumstances, we dispose-of the application with a direction to the respondents that as and when the posts in the cadre, of Farrash or equivalent are created, the cases of the applicants also should be considered for regularisation in the order of the number of days of service that they had put in, in the department.
- The application is disposed-of accordingly. no order as to costs.

arh.

Date: 24th day of June, 1992.

(Dictated in Open Court)

TYPEL BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIS - BUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH.

THE HOW BLE MR.

THE HOW BLE MR.R.BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)

THE HON BLE MR.T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY : MEDRER (Ó)

THE HON BLE MR.C.J. ROY : MEMBER(J)

Dated: 24- 6 -1992

ORDER JUDGMENT

R.A./C.A./M.A. No.

61/89 O.A.No.

(W.P. NO.

Admitted and interim directions issued

Allowed

Dismissed

Disposed of with directions

Central Administrative Tribunal DESPATCH

HYDERABAD BENCH.

Dismissed as withdraw

Dismissed for Default. M.A.Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.