

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 434 of 1991

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 26th March, 1993

BETWEEN:

Mr. A.Narayan Reddy .. Applicant

AND

The General Manager,
Ordnance Factory Project,
Yeddu-mailaram,
Ministry of Defence,
Government of India,
District Medak, A.P. .. Respondent

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: Mr. Y.Suryanarayana, Advocate

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT: Mr. N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC

CORAM:

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

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian, Member (Admn.)

contd....

.. 2 ..

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

Various extents of lands in Yeddumailaram, Kaisaram and Cheryala Villages were acquired for Ordnance Factory Project in Medak District. At the RECCEE Board meeting held on 20.5.1982 at BMP Project Site in Yeddumailaram village, Sangareddy Taluk, Medak District, it was suggested that in accordance with the State Government policies, it is necessary that employment opportunities should be provided and, therefore, priority should be given for employment of one member each of 672 patta holders. The Presiding Officer on behalf of the respondents stated that the above request of the Collector would be borne in mind and action in accordance with the Central Government instructions will be taken. In pursuance of the said understanding, the District Collector, Medak District sent a list of 491 patta holders with their dependents. It is stated for the respondents that 360 were provided with the jobs.

contd....

.. 3 ..

2. The case of the applicant is that he was adopted by the Patta holder Mr. A.Pulla Reddy and even though ~~his~~ the latter's land was acquired for the respondents, he was not provided with the job. The case of the respondents is that Mr.Vittal Reddy, dependent of Mr. A.Pulla Reddy was already given the job. ~~Hence~~ ^{and hence} the applicant is not entitled to the job in view of the understanding as per the suggestion of the District Collector on 20.5.1982.

3. But, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the lands of the patta holder in four pattas in Yeddu-mallaram village were acquired and ^{As} four members of the patta holder had to be provided with the job. But that is not the intention of the understanding referred to. Offer of the job is only by way of humanitarian considerations. Hence, it has to be stated that even if the lands in more than one patta of the same patta holder were acquired for the respondents, ~~the~~ job has to be provided to only one member of his family. As Mr. ~~Vittal~~ Reddy belonging to the family of the patta holder was provided with job, there is no basis for the claim for a job by the applicant. Hence, there is no need to consider as to whether ~~the family of~~ the applicant was adopted by the patta holder.

contd....

13A

.. 4 ..

4. In the result, the OA is dismissed. There is no order as to costs.

(Dictated in the open Court).

Vice
(V. NEELADRI RAO)
Vice Chairman

R. Balasubramanian
(R. BALASUBRAMANIAN)
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 26th March, 1993.

8/4/93
Deputy Registrar (J)

To

vsn

1. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory Project, Yeddu-mailaram, Min. of Defence, Govt. of India, Medak Dist.
2. One copy to Mr. Y. Suryanarayana, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
3. One copy to Mr. N. V. Rama na, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
4. One spare copy.

pvm.

*Padam
6/4/93*