

Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

O.A. No. 26/91

Date of Decision: 10.1.1991

T.A.No. -

B. Satyanarayana

Petitioner.

Sri C. Suryanarayana

Advocate for the
petitioner (s)

Versus

The AET, REP, Secunderaband and others

Respondent.

Sri E. Madan Mohan Rao, Addl.CGSC

Advocate for the
Respondent (s)

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. B.N. JAYASIMHA, VC

THE HON'BLE MR. J. NARASIMHAMURTHY, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *no*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *no*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? *no*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? *no*
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)

B.N.J.
(HBNJ)

J.N.M.
(HJNM)

36

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT : HYDERABAD

D.A. No.26/91

Date of order:10.1.1991

Between

B. Satyanarayana

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. The Asst.Engineer,Telecom,
Railway Electrification Project,
Padmaraoonagar,
Secunderabad.

2. The Divisional Engineer,Telecom,
REP, Padmaraoonagar,Secunderabad.

3. The Telecom District Manager,
Visakhapatnam.

4. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom, A.P., Hyderabad.

5. The Director-General,Telecom,
New Delhi.

.. Respondents

--

Appearance

For the Applicant : Shri C. Suryanarayana, Advocate

For the Respondents : Shri E. Madan Mohan Rao, Addl.CGSC

..

Coram

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI J. NARASIMHA MURTHY, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

--

bw

(Contd.....)

(38)

who came under the control of the Divisional Engineer, Telecom, REP, Secunderabad. From July, 1990 the applicant was asked to work in Machilipatnam Telecom Division during the months of July, August, and Sept., 1990 and thereafter discharged from service. He was employed for 60 days in those months. During the one year preceeding his termination, the applicant was employed for 324 days i.e., for more than 240 days in a year. The applicant states that according to the orders issued by the Director General, Telecom, New Delhi in his No. 269-69/88-STN dt.17.10.1988 a combined seniority list of all casual mazdoors in respect of a recruitment unit will be maintained and the list will include all casual mazdoors belonging to the territorial jurisdiction of the recruitment unit, for various functional units such as Telecom/Projects/ Maintenance Regions, Electrification Projects and Quality Assurance Circles etc., to which they are attached. Absorption of Casual Labourers against regular Gr.'D' posts or their retrenchment due to exigencies such as non-availability of work has to be done strictly according to the combined seniority list. The Supreme Court in DAILY RATED CASUAL LABOUR UNDER THE P&T SERVICES VS. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (AIR) 1987 SC 2342), directed that casual labourer who had put in one year service (240 days service in a year) should be regularised in accordance with a scheme to be worked out by the Departments. Subsequently the Supreme Court in RAMGOPAL & OTHERS Vs. UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS., in WP (C) No.1280/89 etc.,

bvi

(Contd...)

uo

directed that "the respondents shall prepare a scheme on a rational basis for absorbing as far as practicable, the casual labourers who have continuously worked for more than one year in the Telecom Dept., and this should be done within 6 months from now". The Supreme Court had also observed that no distinction can be drawn between the petitioners as a class of employees and those who were recruited and employed before the Supreme Court's order in the AIR 1987 SC 2342 and that on principle the benefit of the decision in AIR 1987 SC 2342 must be taken to apply even to those who were recruited after 30.3.1985. The applicant therefore prays that a direction be issued to the respondents to prepare a seniority list in accordance with the directions of the Director General, P&T referred to above and confer temporary status on him and engage him for work according to his seniority in the relevant recruitment unit pending his absorption on a regular basis.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant Shri C. Suryanarayana, and Shri E. Madan Mohan Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the Central Govt. who takes notice at the admission stage. All that Shri Suryanarayana argues is that the Department has not undertaken/completed the preparation of seniority list for implementing the orders of the Supreme Court in DAILY RATES CASUAL LABOUR IN P&T., Vs. UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS (AIR 1987 SC 2342) and in RAM GOPAL AND OTHERS Vs.

b/s

(Contd....)

To

1. The Asst. Engineer, Telecom,
Railway Electrification Project,
Padmaraonagar, Secunderabad.
2. The Divisional Engineer, Telecom, REP,
Padmaraonagar, Secunderabad
3. The Telecom District Manager, Visakhapatnam.
4. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, A.P.Hyderabad.
5. The Director-General, Telecom, New Delhi.
6. One copy to Mr. C.Suryanarayan, Advocate. CAT.Hyd.Bench.
7. One copy to Mr.E.Madanmohan Rao, Addl. CGSC. CAT.Hyd.Bench.
8. One copy to Hon'ble Mr.J,Narasimha Murty, Member(J)CAT.Hyd.
9. One spare copy.

pvm

(ul)

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS in W.P.(C) No. 1280/89.

Because of the delay in the preparation of seniority and regularisation of the services in terms of decision of the Supreme Court and implementing for which the Director General, Telecom had issued a circular dt. 17.10.1988, the applicant does not know where he stands as regards his seniority in his recruitment unit and therefore has reason to believe that his juniors are being appointed in preference to him. Shri Suryanarayana therefore states that he limits his prayer to issuance of a direction to the respondents to prepare a seniority list within a time to be specified by the Court and engage the applicant subject to the availability of work according to his position in the seniority list. He also states that he should be given temporary status in terms of these judgements and in terms of Director-General, Telecom's circular dt.17.10.1988. We find considerable merit in the submissions made by Shri Suryanarayana and accordingly direct the respondents to prepare the seniority list for the recruitment of the applicant within a period of three months in compliance with D.G., P&Ts letter dt.17.10.1988, and reengage the applicant in accordance with the seniority subject to the availability of work. The respondents will also extend such other benefits as are envisaged in the D.G., P&T's letter dated 17.10.1988.

The application is allowed to the extent indicated above. No order as to costs.

B.N. Jayasimha
(B.N. JAYASIMHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN

MS
(J. NARASIMHA MURTHY)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Dictated in the open court
Dt.10.1.1991

[Signature]
Deputy Registrar (J)

5

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

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

AND

THE HON'BLE ~~MR.D.SURYA RAO~~ : M(J)

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 10-1-1991.

~~ORDER~~ / JUDGMENT:

M.A./R.A. /C.A. NO.

in

T.A.No.

W.P.No.

O.A.No.

26/91

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with direction

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

