

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

29

CP No. 84/92
O.A. No. 726/90
T.A. No.

Dt. of Decision 1-3-93

Petitioner

Advocate for
the petitioner
(s)

Versus

Respondent.

Advocate for
the Respondent
(s)

ACORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.

THE HON'BLE MR.

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

ns

HRBS
n(A)

HTCR
n(J)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 84 of 1992

IN

O.A.NO. 726/90

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 1st March, 1993.

BETWEEN:

Mr. V.Thirupathaiah Goud

..

Applicant

AND

1. Mr. Khwaja Moinuddin,
Sub Divisional Officer,
Telecom, Gadwal-509125.
2. Mr. K.V.Choudary,
Telecom District Engineer,
Mahabubnagar-50.
3. Mr. GV Gopichandran,
General Manager,
Telecom, Hyderabad Area,
Secunderabad-3.
4. Mr. H.P.Wagle,
Chairman,
Telecom Commission,
(representing Union of India),
New Delhi-1.

..

Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: Mr. V.Hanumantha Rao

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. NR Devaraj, Sr.CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian, Member (Admn.)

Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member (Judl.)

contd...

To

1. Mr.Khwaja Moinuddin, Sub Divisional Officer,
Telecom, Gadwal-125.
2. Mr.K.V.Choudary, Telecom Dist.Engineer,
Mahabubnagar-50.
3. Mr.G.V.Gopichandran, General Manager, Telecom,
Hyderabad Area, Secunderabad-3.
4. Mr.H.P.Wagle, Chairman,
Telecom Commission, Union of India, New Delhi-1.
5. One copy to Mr.V.Hanumantha Rao Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm


.. 2 ..

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


When the case was called, Mr. Mohan Kumar sought for adjournment on the ground that Mr. V.Hanumantha Rao, learned counsel for the CP applicant is not available. Heard Mr. N.R.Devaraj, Senior Standing Counsel for the Respondents who stated categorically that there is no work and none junior to the applicant is engaged.

2. In the Judgment dated 11.9.1990 in OA 726/90, by way of interim directions, it was directed to to engage the applicant if work is available and in preference to outsiders. In view of the Statement of the learned Senior Standing Counsel for the respondents, the contempt petition is liable to be dismissed and it is dismissed accordingly with no order as to costs.

(Dictated in the open Court).




(R.BALASUBRAMANIAN)
Member (Admn.)



(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: 1st March, 1993.


Deputy Registrar (5)