

20

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD  
BENCH AT : HYDERABAD

O. A. No. 559/90

Date of Order: 13.7.1990

BETWEEN

K. Jayaram Babu

.. Applicant

Versus

1. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Barkatpura, Hyderabad.
2. Provident Fund Commissioner, Govt. of India, Marripalem, Visakhapatnam.
3. Employment Officer, Employment Exchange (Sub) Amalapuram, East Godavari Dist.

.. Respondents

APPEARANCE

For the applicant : Mr. G. Krishna Murthy & K. Venkata Rao, Advocates

For the Respondents : Mr. G. Parameswara Rao, Advocate for Respondents No.1 and 2.  
Mr. D. Pandu Ranga Reddy, Special Counsel for the State of A.P for Respondent No.3.

--

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. B.N. JAYASIMHA, VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE MR. D. SURYA RAO, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

(Judgement of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble Mr. D. Surya Rao)  
Member (Judicial)

The applicant herein is an unemployed youth who has registered his name with the Employment Exchange., Amalapuram, East Godavari Dist., i.e., respondent No.3. He has filed this application aggrieved by the action of the third respondent in not sponsoring his name in response to the requisition received from respondent No.1 for the post of messenger.

2. The applicant states that he is an S.C candidate and has studied upto Xth Class. He has registered his name in the Employment Exchange, Amalapuram and his Regd., No. is CR/A/1301/87 and the same was renewed by CR/A/601/90. He has been waiting for call letters from the third respondent. On enquiry he came to know that the first respondent wrote a letter to the second respondent to fill up the posts of Messengers in his organisation and sent a reference on 25.4.90 for sponsoring the names, for filling up nearly 30 posts of Messengers. The applicant sent an application directly to the first respondent and second respondent. But they informed the applicant that his name was not sponsored by the third respondent and therefore his name could not be considered. The main contention of the applicant is that the respondent No.3 has overlooked his seniority in the matter of registration and has sponsored persons who had registered themselves subsequent to his registration. He therefore seeks a direction to respondent No.3 to sponsor his name and for respondents No.1 and 2 to consider his name also for the post of Messengers along with others.

(W)

(Contd.....)

To

1. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Barkatpura, Hyd.
2. The Provident Fund Commissioner, Govt. of India, Marripalem, visakhapatnam.
3. The Employment Officer, Employment Exchange (sub) Amalapuram, East Godavari Dist.
4. One copy to Mr.G.Krishna Murty, Advocate. ~~Ex~~ 5-9-22/8/A? Adarshnagar, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.G.Parameswara Rao, Advocate for RR 1 and 2.
6. One copy to Mr.D.Panduranga Reddy, Spl.Counsel for the State of A.P. for R.3.
7. One spare copy.

File No. 17

pvm

8/10/97  
18/7

3. We have heard Shri G. Krishna Murthy, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Parameshwara Rao, learned counsel for the respondents No.1 and 2, and Shri Pandu Ranga Reddy, counsel for the respondent No.3. The main contention of the learned counsel for the applicant is that the respondent No.3 Employment Officer, Employment Exchange, Amalapuram, erred in not sponsoring the name of the applicant while sponsoring the names of persons, who have registered their names subsequent to him. We <sup>of the applicant</sup> therefore direct the respondent No.3 to sponsor the name <sup>if</sup> if he has sponsored the name of any person who had registered subsequent to the registration of the applicant herein, i.e., CR/A/1301/87, and intimate the same to the applicant within two weeks from the date of receipt of this order. In the event of the applicant being senior and his name is sponsored by the Employment Exchange, the respondents No.1 and 2 will consider the case of the applicant for screening test along with others. <sup>and if</sup> <sup>the respondents are directed to</sup> the screening test is already conducted, to arrange a separate <sup>screening</sup> test for him. The application is disposed off with the above directions. No order as to costs.

*B.N.Jayashimha*  
(B.N. JAYASIMHA)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

*D.Surya Rao*  
(D. SURYA RAO)  
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Dictated in the open court  
Dt. 13th July, 1990

*7/1/1990*  
S. DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JUDL)

MSN M  
1977

(4)

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. B.N. JAYASIMHA : V.C.

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. D. SURYA RAO : MEMBER (JUDG.)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. J. NARASIMHA MURTHY : M(J)

AND

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

DATE : 13/2/90

ORDER / JUDGMENT

M.A./R.A./C.A./No. 18

T.A. No.

W.P. No.

D.A. No. 559/90

Admitted and Interim directions issued.

Allowed.

Dismissed for default.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed.

Disposed of with direction.

M.A. ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

