

(21)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.425/90.

Date of Judgement 9-9-92

K.V.V.Prasad

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. The Telecom. Dist. Engineer,
Anantapur-515001.
2. The Director-General, Telecom.,
(Reptg. Union of India),
New Delhi-110001.
3. The Employment Officer,
Dist. Employment Exchange
Anantapur-515001. .. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri C.Suryanarayana

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC
Shri D.Panduranga Reddy, SC for A

CORAM:

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

Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy : Member(J)

X Judgement as per Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian, Member(A) X

This application has been filed by Shri K.V.V.Prasad against the Telecom. Dist. Engineer, Anantapur-515001 & 2 other under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The prayer in this application is for a direction to the respondents to treat his name as having been sponsored by the 3rd respondent and consider his candidature for selection and appointment as Driver under the 1st respondent.

2. The applicant is registered with the Employment Exchange at Anantapur vide Registration No.492/87 dt. 10.2.87. When the Telecom. Dist. Engineer, Anantapur invited some nominations from the Employment Exchange, he thought his name would be sponsored by the Employment Exchange. It is stated that on enquiries made he was told that the Employment Exchange had nominated only ~~Ex~~ Servicemen and there being only 5 posts the names of ex-Servicemen were nominated. When he approached

✓

To

1. The Telecom. Dist.Engineer, Anantapur-1.
2. The Director-General, Telecom Union of India, New Delhi-1.
3. The Employment Officer, Dist.Employment Exchange, Anantapur-1.
4. One copy to Mr.C:Suryanarayana, Advocate, CA T.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd
6. One copy to Mr.D.Panduranga Reddy, Spl.Counsel for A.P.Govt. CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm.

the Telecom. authorities he was told that they would consider only the names sponsored by the Employment Exchange. Hence this application on the ground that he being competent and eligible should also be considered for the post required to be filled up by the respondents.

3. The respondents have filed a counter affidavit and oppose the application. It is stated that a list of 20 candidates for selection and recruitment of two Motor Drivers had been forwarded by the Employment Exchange. The list contained the names of 10 ex-Servicemen, 3 physically handicapped and 7 others belonging to both S.C. and S.T.

4. We have heard the rival sides and examined the case. The applicant has alleged that the Employment Exchange, Anantapur had sent a list exclusively of ex-Servicemen. An examination of the list sent under cover of letter Rc.No.A2/10/90 dt. 13.2.90 of the Dist. Employment Officer, Anantapur shows that the allegation is baseless. It contains several names of different categories. It is also seen that in the category to which the applicant belongs, none junior to him was sponsored. In the requisition sent by the Telecom. authorities to the Employment Exchange at Anantapur it had even been indicated that there will be relaxation of upper age limit in the case of ex-Servicemen. It would, therefore, be clear that the nomination of ex-Servicemen is well in order and moreover the Employment Exchange is under instructions to nominate specific categories of candidates for providing equitable job opportunities. ~~There is~~, Therefore, we are unable to find anything wrong in the list forwarded by the Employment Exchange. The applicant has no case. The O.A. is dismissed with no order as to costs.

R.Balasubramanian
(R.Balasubramanian)
Member(A).

T.Chandrasekhara Reddy
(T.Chandrasekhara Reddy)
Member(J).

Dated: 9 September, 1992.

88/10/92
Realty Registrar(J)

203
TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE MR.

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY :
MEMBER (J)

AND

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

Dated: 9 - 9 - 1992

ORDER / JUDGMENT.

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

in

O.A. No. 425 / 90

T.A. No.

(W.P. No)

Admitted and interim directions
issued

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered / Rejected

Central Administrative Tribunal
DESPATCH

No orders as to costs.

13 OCT 1992
HYDERABAD BENCH.

pvm.