

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.831/92

Dt.of order:07.06.1995

Between

Smt M.Ramadevi .. Applicant

and

1. Union of India Rep by
Secretary, Min. of Communications
New Delhi-1.

2. General Manager,
Telecommunications
Hyderabad Area
Secunderabad 500 003

3. Telecom District Manager
Sanchar Bhavan
Tirupati .. Respondent

Counsel for the applicant :: Mr T.Jayant

Counsel for the Respondents:: Mr NV Ramana, CGSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE-CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI, MEMBER(ADMN)

...2



ORDER

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

The applicant joined the Telecom Department as a LDC on 16.11.1981. She was served with a charge memo dated 18.1.1984 alleging that, at the time of her recruitment, she gave false statement that she appeared for Clerks' Grade Examination of Staff Selection Commission, Madras, held in August, 1980. A regular enquiry was conducted at the end of which, the applicant was held guilty of the charge and she was awarded the penalty of removal from service. Aggrieved by this, she has filed the present OA praying that the impugned penalty order dated 14.6.91 be set aside as illegal and that she may be reinstated into service with all consequential benefits.

2. Heard learned counsel for both the parties.
3. Quite a few employees came to be recruited by the Telecom Department on the basis of such letters purporting to have been issued by the Staff Selection Commission. Such letters were all found to be false documents and accordingly, the matter was investigated. *Several employees, with the collusion of some officials in the Telecom Department, some candidates with the help of the fake documents purported to have been issued by the Staff Selection Commission, got appointment orders issued in their favour.* The applicant is one among them.
4. As a result of the inquiries held against those employees, they were either dismissed or removed. They approached the Tribunal challenging the validity of the impugned order on various grounds; but without success.



The grounds raised by the applicant in the present OA are similar to those that were raised by other applicants in other OAs, and which were rejected by the Tribunal in the past. In this context OA 509/93 decided by this Bench on 31.1.1995 may be referred.

5. In view of what is stated above, there is hardly any scope for giving any relief to the applicant in the present OA. The OA is therefore dismissed. There shall be no orders as to costs. /

Amulya S
(A.B. GONTHI)

Member (Admn)

V. Neeladri Rao
(V. NEELADRI RAO)
Vice-Chairman

Dated: The 7th June, 1995

Dictated in the open court

Amulya S
Dy. Registrar (J) CC

mvl
To

1. The Secretary, Ministry of Communications, Union of India, New Delhi-1.
2. The General Manager, Telecommunications Hyderabad Area, Secunderabad-3.
3. The Telecom District Manager, Sanchar Bhavan, Tirupati.
4. One copy to Mr. T. Jayanti, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

100
100

THPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

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

A N D

A. B. Gorde

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

DATED - 7/6/1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

O.A. No.

in

831/92

TA. No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered / Rejected.

No order as to costs.

No space copy

968

