

113

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.801/91

Date of Order 11.8.1992

BETWEEN:

Ahmed Hussain

... Applicant

A N D

1. Union of India, rep. by
Director General,
Telecommunications,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom - A.P., Telecom
Administrative Building,
Station Road, Nampally,
Hyderabad.
3. Divisional Engineer,
Microwave Project,
Baglingam pally,
Hyderabad.
4. Superintending Engineer,
Telecom (Civil) Circle,
Chikkaapally,
Hyderabad.
5. Executive Engineer,
Telecom-Civil Division No.1,
Barkatpura Hyderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.N.Rajeswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.N.R.Devraj

CORAM:

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

(Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by

Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member(Judl.)).

T. C. R.

Copy to:-

1. Director General, Telecommunications, Union of India, New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecom-A.P., Telecom Administrative Building, Station road, Nampally, Hyd.
3. Divisional Engineer, Microwave Project, Baglingampally, Hyd-bad.
4. Superintending Engineer, Telecom (Civil) Circle, Chikkadapally, Hyd-bad.
5. Executive Engineer, Telecom-Civil Division No.1, Barkatpura, Hyd.
6. One copy to Sri. N.Rajeswara Rao, advocate, 16-2-705/8/2/A, Malakpet, Hyd.
7. One copy to Sri. N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

8022 final
per C.D.
7.

21)

(H)

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to regularise the leave period of the applicant from 18.7.1981 to 17.11.1982 and to treat the period from ~~29.11~~ 29.11.1982 to 15.7.1987 as duty period and further to direct the respondents to pay the arrears of salary and consequential benefits and allowances to the applicant for which he is entitled and to pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant has filed a memo stating that the department is considering the case of the applicant and in these circumstances that the applicant intends to withdraw from the OA.

3. We have heard Mr.N.Rajeswara Rao, for the applicant and Mr.N.R.Devraj, Standing counsel for the respondents. After hearing both sides in view of the said memo we dismiss the said OA as withdrawn. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

Dated: 11th August, 1992.

(Dictated in the Open Court)

8/11/92
Deputy Registrar (Judl.)

14/8/92
T.C. O.A. 801/91.
TYPED BY (3)

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE MR.

AND

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY :
MEMBER (J)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER (J)

Dated: 11/8/1992 ✓

ORDER / JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A. No.

801/91 ✓

T.A. No.

(W.P. No. —)

Admitted and interim directions
issued

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered / Rejected

No orders as to costs.

pvm.

