

22

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

* * *
* *
*

O.A. 739/91.

Dt. of Decision : 18.4.1994.

1. Ch. Srinivasa Rao
2. Rajeshwar Prasad
3. Manipatruni Sasi Bhushan
4. Baleshwar Gosai
5. Jagdeep Singh Shoran
6. Kajanchi Lal
7. Hruda Nanda Sahoo
8. P.V. Sivadasan
9. P.S. Raju
10. R. Appa Rao
11. P. Sree Rama Murthy
12. Surendra Singh
13. K. Ganga Rao
14. Aurn Kumar Mohanty
15. D. Penta Rao
16. Charan Singh
17. Abhay Kumar Mairh
18. B. Surya Rao
19. M.V.S. Prasad
20. T. Kameswara Rao
21. K.S.N. Murthy
22. S.V. Subba Rao
23. Smt. M.S. Ramamlkshmi
24. D. Murmu
25. L.S.S. Appa Rao
26. S.A. Acharyulu
27. B. Chandra Rao
28. S. Kotilingam
29. K. Mohan
30. K.S.R. Raju
31. Smt. Y. Ratna Kumari
32. M. Venkata Rao
33. K. Govinda Rao
34. D.A. Satyanarayana
35. Ashok Kumar Das
36. Sitaram panda
37. N.A.P. Sharma
38. M.S.R. Subrahmanyam
39. B. Venkateswara Rao
40. Ch. Rama Rao
41. K. Rama Subba Rao
42. Bhairab Kamat
43. P. Appala Naidu
44. S. Appala Naidu
45. Gopinath Prusty
46. G.V.V. Lakshmi Narayana
47. S.K. Karan
48. P.R. Prasadgupta
49. Prasanna Kumar Nanda
50. G. Bullaiabbai
51. B. Ramachandra Rao
52. O.V.G. Krishna Rao
53. Gopibandhu Ojha
54. P. Nagabhushanam
55. N. Lakshmi Narayana
56. V. Venkata Papa Rao
57. Sunny Chacko
58. Kotha Krishna Rao
59. Inampudi Sivaiah
60. M. Jagga Rao
61. Smt. Janaki Raghavan
62. D. Devendradeo
63. Manjit Singh
64. Bijayakumar Behru
65. M.L.B. Sastry

.. Applicants.

Vs

Union of India represented by:

1. The Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief Naval Staff,
Naval Headquarters,
New Delhi.
3. Director of Civilian Personnel,
Naval Headquarters,
New Delhi.
4. Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief,
Eastern Naval Command,
Visakhapatnam.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr. K.S.R. Anjaneyulu

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (JUD.)

..2

[Handwritten signatures and initials are present on the left side of the page, including 'J. R. K.', 'S', and 'X' below the 'CORAM:' section.]

To

1. The Secretary to Govt. of India,
Union of India, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Naval Staff, Naval Headquarters,
New Delhi.
3. The Director of Civilian Personnel, Naval Headquarters,
New Delhi.
4. The Flag Officer, Commanding-in-Chief,
Eastern Naval Command, Visakhapatnam.
5. One copy to Mr. K. S. R. Anjaneyulu, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. OGSC. CAT. Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, "CAT. Hyd." "CAT. Hyd."
8. One spare copy.

pvm

*BSP
H. J. P.
A. O.
P. O. M.
J. A. M.*

ORDER

(As per Hon'ble Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member(J))

The applicants herein are 65 in number. They have filed this OA to direct the respondents to give them the same revised pay scales as had been allowed to the

(Draughtsman in CPWD and in MES. All the applicants herein are working as Senior Draughtsman/Head Draughtsman and Draughtsman in the Eastern Naval Command, Naval Base, Visakhapatnam.

2. Senior Draughtsman/Head Draughtsman/Draughtsman who are similarly placed to the applicants herein in Southern Naval Command, Naval Base, Cochin, had filed OA 400/91 on the file of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench for the very same relief, the applicants herein have asked for. OA 400/91 had been dismissed as per the Judgement of the Ernakulam Bench dated 23.10.92 on merits.

Mr NV Ramana, Standing Counsel for the respondents submitted that a SLP that had been filed before the Supreme Court as against the Judgement of the Ernakulam Bench dated 23.10.92 in OA 400/91, was also dismissed. So, it is quite evident that the Judgement in OA 400/91 dated 23.10.92 on the file of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench had become final. There is no dispute about the fact that that the applicants herein are similarly placed in all respects to the applicants in OA 400/91, on the file of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench. So, as OA 400/91 on the file of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench had been dismissed as per judgement dated 23.10.92, for the very same reasons, the present OA is also liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed leaving the parties bear their own costs.

M. R. Rangarajan
(R. RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn)

T. Chandrasekhara Reddy
(T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: The 18th April, 1994

(Dictated in the open court) By: Regd. Sten. (S) CC

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTHI : MEMBER(AD)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. C. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER(JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN : M(ADMN)

Dated: 18-9-1994

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

O.A.No.

in
739/91

T.A.No.

(w.p.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

pvm

