

23

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

* * *

O.A. 412/91

Dt. of Decision : 4.4.1994

1. M. Veera Reddy
2. V. Jagadeeswari

.. Applicants

Vs

1. The Central Provident Fund Commissioner
9th Floor, Cannaught Circus,
Mayur Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner
Barkatpura, Hyderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr.N.Rama Mohana Rao
Counsel for the Respondents : Mr.Vilas V Afzulpurkar,
SC for P.F.

CORAM:

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

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

..2

1581
8
7

To _____

1. The Central Provident Fund Commissioner,
9th Floor, Cannaught Circus, Mayur Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner,
Barkatpura,, Hyderabad.
3. One copy to Mr.N.Rammohan Rao, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr.vilas v.Afzulpurkar, SC for P.F. CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
- 6..One sparecopy.

pvm

*32/11/74
R-10/24
7/9/74*

341
O.A. 412 /91

Dt. of Decision : 4.4.94

ORDER

I As per Hon'ble Shri A.B. Gorthi, Member (Admn.) I

The applicants herein are aggrieved by the orders of the respondents dt. 23.1.1991 and 14.2.1991 by means of which their pay was refixed. Their claim is that the said orders be set aside with all consequential benefits.

2. In the seniority list dt. 27.11.1982 the applicants' names figures at Sl.No. 26 and 18 respectively. As per directions given in OA 491/86 in which the applicants were not parties, the seniority list was refixed and the applicants went down to Sl.No. 39 and 32 respectively in the revised seniority list. Consequent to the revision of their seniority, the applicants were reverted to the post of Head Clerk\$ on 12.12.1988 ^{and} under after ^a pay\$ gap they were repromoted as Enforcement Officers on 14.12.1988. In view of the repromotion of the applicants their pay was refixed by means of the impugned orders.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants has now shown us letter No. AP/Adm.I/Pay fix/EOs/AAOs/94 dt.14.2.94, wherein it has been stated that the competent authority agreed to consider the fixation benefits to the applicants as per rules. In the light of such assurance coming from the respondents, the applicants are not desirous for pursuing this matter. It is therefore ^{by the applicants' counsel} requested that the OA to be treated as withdrawn.

4. In view of the above the OA is dismissed as withdrawn.

22/9/94
T. Chandrasekhara Reddy
(T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
MEMBER (JUDL.)

A.B. Gorthi
(A.B. GORTHI)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Dated : The 4th April 1994
(Dictated in Open Court)

spr

Prabha Ramu
Deputy Registrar (C) ca