

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

13

O.A. No. 133/91

Dt. of Decision ~~xxx~~ 18.6.93

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. P.T. Thiruvengadam, Member (Admn.)

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

HPTT
M(A)

HVNR.j
VC

14

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.133 of 1991

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 18th June, 1993

BETWEEN:

Mr. M.Sreenivasulu

..

Applicant

AND

1. The Employment Exchange Officer,
Kurnool.

2. The Assistant Engineer (Civil),
All India Radio,
Kurnool.

..

Respondents

APPEARANCE:

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: Mr. V.S.N.Sarma .. NOT PRESENT

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. D.Panduranga Reddy, Special
Counsel for the State of Andhra
Pradesh, for the 1st respondent.

Mr. N.V.Ramana, Standing Counsel
for the Central Government, for
the 2nd respondent.

CORAM:

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

Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member (Admn.)

contd....

.. 2 ..

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

Niether the applicant nor his learned counsel is present. Heard the learned counsel for the 1st respondent Mr. D.Panduranga Reddy and the learned Counsel for the 2nd respondent, Mr. V.Rajeswara Rao representing Mr. N.V.Ramana.

2. This OA was filed seeking a direction to the 1st respondent to sponsor the name of the applicant to the 2nd respondent for the purpose of calling him for interview for appointment to the post of Peon in the existing vacancy. The applicant alleged that in pursuance of the requisition by the 2nd respondent to the 1st respondent, the Employment Exchange Officer, Kurnool, ~~the later~~ had sent a list of names which include the names of those with Registration Nos.1/89 and 7/89 and they were juniors to him and hence the direction as prayed ~~xxxx~~ for had to be given. This Court passed an interim order on 8.2.1991 which is to the effect that the 1st respondent had to sponsor the name of the applicant also if his name is found in the live register and if his juniors have been sponsored (as ^{is seen} ~~is seen~~, the relevant portion is a mistake for "and", as can be seen from the context). It is stated for the 2nd respondent that the name of the applicant was not sent ~~till then~~ even after the above interim order was passed. The applicant had not filed any contempt petition to the effect that the interim order is not complied with. So, in view of the ^{material on record} ~~matter~~ it has to be infered that as the allegations of the applicant are not proved, the question of

contd....

.. 3 ..

implementing of the interim order by the 2nd respondent had not arisen. Further, it is to be seen that no one is appearing for the applicant for the earlier adjournments and even today though it is listed for dismissal, probably the applicant might have felt that there is ^{no} case for him and hence he is not evincing any interest.

3. In the result, the OA is dismissed. No costs.

(Dictated in the open Court).

P. T. Thiruvengadam
(P.T.THIRUVENGADAM)
Member (Admn.)

V. Neeladri Rao
(V.NEELADRI RAO)
Vice Chairman

Dated: 18th June, 1993. Dy. Registrar (Judl.) *823/6/93*

vsn

Copy to:-

1. The Employment ~~Exchange~~ Exchange Officer, Kurnool.
2. The Assistant Engineer (Civil), All India Radio, Kurnool.
3. One copy to Sri. V.S.N. Sarma, advocate, High Court Advocates Associations, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. D. Panduranga Reddy, Spl. Counsel for the A.P. State.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

23/6

O.A. 133/91

TYPED BY

[Signature]

COMPARED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

HYDERABAD BENCH

HYDERABAD

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. V. Neeladri Reddy V.C.

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. ^{P. Thiruvengadam} ~~R. BALASUBRAMANIAN~~ M(A)

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 18/6/1992

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

O.A. No.

in

133/91

T.A. No.

(W.P. No. _____)

Admitted and Interim directions issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as with drawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

pvm.

