

(6)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

R.P. No. 16/94
in
D.A. No. 118/91.

Dt. of Decision : 10.6.91. 4

1. Inspector of Works,
Railway Electrification,
Vijayawada.
2. Divisional Engineer,
Railway Electrification,
Vijayawada.
3. Divisional Engineer,
Railway Electrification,
Kazipet.
4. Chief Project Manager,
Railway Electrification,
Vijayawada.
5. General Manager,
Railway Electrification,
Allahabad.

.. Applicants

Vs

Mr. R. Nageswara Rao

.. Respondent.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr. V. Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC.

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. G.V. Subba Rao

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTI : MEMBER (ADMN.)

THE HON'BLE SHRI T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY : MEMBER (JUDL.)

..2

Est page
1

RP 16/94 in
OA. 118/91



.. 2 ..

Order of the Division Bench delivered by
Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (Admn.).

In this Review Petition the prayer is for reconsideration of our judgement dated 4.10.93 in O.A.118/91. While disposing of the OA, we directed that the applicant would be allowed to count the entire period of past service from the date of his initial engagement on 6.12.80 to 11.5.86 for all purposes. We further directed that the period from 11.5.86 to 13.3.90 shall ~~also~~ count only for the purpose of the applicant's seniority for consideration for regular absorption.

2. In the Review Petition it is now stated that the applicant was engaged on 10.11.82 in the Railway Electrification and his earlier service as a casual labour under IOW Construction, Guntakal Division could not be taken into consideration. We are not inclined to accept this contention which is now being raised in the Review Petition, because the fact remains that the applicant was initially engaged as a casual mazdoor on 6.12.80.

3. The second contention raised is that the period of absence from 11.5.86 to 27.4.87 could not be reckoned for the purpose of seniority until and unless the said period is regularised under normal rules. We accept this contention raised by the respondents' counsel and accordingly we allow the Review Petition to the limited extent that it is open to the respondents to consider regularisation of the period from 11.5.86 to

h

2nd p.

..3

.. 3 ..

27.4.87 in accordance with the extant rules and take a decision in the matter. Subject to this observation we find no merit ^{in the Revision Petition &} and the same is hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

(A.B.GORTHY)
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 10th June, 1994

(Dictated in Open Court)

sd

Deputy Registrar (Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. Inspector of Works, Railway Electrification, Vijayawada.
2. Divisional Engineer, Railway Electrification, Vijayawada.
3. Divisional Engineer, Railway Electrification, Kazipet.
4. Chief Project Manager, Railway Electrification, Vijayawada.
5. General Manager, Railway Electrification, Allahabad.
6. One copy to Sri. V.Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
7. One copy to Sri. G.V.Subba Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
8. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
9. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

3rd page
29/6/94