

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

O.A. NO. 509/90

Dt. of Decision 2.4.93

T.A. NO.

Petitioner

Advocate for
the petitioner
(s)

Versus

Respondent.

Advocate for
the Respondent
(s)

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, Vice Chairman

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

SV
HVNR.J
VC

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.509 of 1990

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 2nd April, 1993

BETWEEN:

S/Shri/Smt./Kum.

1. D.Prabhakar
2. N.P.Venkataadri Prasad
3. P.Narayana Reddy
4. T.Sreedhara Swamy
5. Sivaraju Dadi
6. Ramarao Rayani
7. B.Subhadra
8. K.S.Ramani
9. S.K.Agarwal
10. B.Srinivasa Rao
11. J.Siva Kumar
12. P.Surendranath
13. B.Ramulu
14. L.M.Srivatsa
15. M.Sankaran
16. S.Jayaraman
17. Prakash Chand
18. M.M.Ahmad
19. Anand Krishna
20. M.V.B.A.S.Sastry
21. K.V.Narayana Murthy
22. N.S.Harishchandra Rao
23. G.C.Subba Raju
24. D.V.Ramanaiah
25. U.K.Acharyulu
26. R.Srikantaiah
27. G.Poshetti
28. K.Prahладa Rao

Applicants

(Applicants 29 to 43 were deleted as per orders
of the Tribunal dated 7.12.1990.)

AND

contd....

.. 2 ..

1. The Union of India, represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Dept. of Expenditure, New Delhi-110001.
2. The Union of India represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Defence (DHQ PO), New Delhi-11.
3. The Director General, Defence Research Development Organisation, Ministry of Defence (DHQ PO), New Delhi-11.
4. The Director, Defence Electronics Research Laboratory, Hyderabad-500005. .. Respondents

(Respondents 5 and 6 were deleted as per the orders of the Tribunal dated 7.12.90).

APPEARANCE:

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS: Mr. P.R.Prasad, Advocate

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Neeladri Rao, Vice Chairman

JUDGMENT OF THE SINGLE MEMBER BENCH DELIVERED BY THE HON'BLE
SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

Heard Mr. P.R.Prasad, learned counsel for the applicants and Mr. N.R.Devaraj, learned Senior Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

2. The applicants herein are Scientists 'C' in Defence Electronics Research Laboratory and they were promoted after 1.1.1986. This OA was filed praying for

contd....

To

1. The Secretary, Union of India,
Ministry of Finance, Dept. of Expenditure,
New Delhi-1.
2. The Secretary, Union of India, Min. of Defence (DHQ PO)
New Delhi-11.
3. The Director General, Defence Research Development
Organisation, Min. of Defence (DHQ PO), New Delhi-11.
4. The Director, Defence Electronics Research Laboratory,
Hyderabad-5.
5. One copy to Mr. P. R. Prasad, Advocate, Flat No. 104
1-1-648/2A, Gandhi Nagar, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Sr CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

With a copy of order in

OB 673, 674 PO
CL 24.73

pvm

13/1/73

23

.. 3 ..

a declaration that the orders passed by the Respondent-4 on 9.8.1989 pursuant to the proceedings dated 13.7.1989 of Respondent-3, in discontinuing the Concordance Tables for those who are promoted as Scientists on or after 1.1.1986 ^{are} is wholly illegal, arbitrary and to direct the respondents to continue the same in the revised pay scale of 1986 and pay all the consequential benefits and arrears.

3. The point which falls for consideration in this OA is covered by the common Judgment in OAs 673 and 674/90. For the reasons stated therein, the respondents are directed to consider about the factors which had given rise for the recommendations of the Pay Commission for introduction of the Concordance Tables and whether they still existed and if so whether it is not desirable to continue ~~those~~ tables even for those who were promoted as Scientists on or after 1.1.1986 especially in view of the various other circumstances referred to for the applicants.

4. The OA is ordered accordingly. No order as to costs. Enclose a copy of the Judgment in OAs 673 and 674/90

(Dictated in the open Court).

VR

(V.NEELADRI RAO)
Vice Chairman

Dated: 2nd April, 1993.

8/3/93
Deputy Registrar