

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

M.A.No.364/92 In O.A.NO.252 of 1992.

Between

Dated: 16.4.1992.

1. M.Narayana.
2. R.Radhakrishna.
3. G.Laxmana Rao.
4. Ch. Venkata Ramana.

5. D.Yerraiyah.
6. P.Babu Rao.
7. V.Mohana Rao.
8. M.Noekaraju.

...
And

1. Union of India represented by the Chairman, Telecom. Commission, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Assistant Engineer(HRD), O/O Telecom District Manager, Visakhapatnam.

...
Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Sri. C.Suryanarayana,

Counsel for the Respondents: Sri. M.Jagan Mohan Reddy, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. R.Balasubramanian, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. T.Chandra Sekhar Reddy, Judicial Member.

(Orders passed by Hon'ble Mr. R.Balasubramanian, Member(A))

M.A.364/92 is allowed. When this case was taken up for admission hearing we have heard Sri. P.Bhaskar, on behalf of Sri. C. Suryanaryana, learned counsel for the applicants and Sri. M.Jagan Mohan Reddy, learned counsel for the Respondents. Sri. Bhaskar, drew our attention to the fact that the impugned order dated 30.1.1992 (Annexure A-3) is in violation of the Arbitration Award shown at Annexure A-1(a). He contends that the action of the Respondents in denying the advance increment to the departmental promotees is illegal. Against this Sri. M.Jagan Mohan Reddy points out that the applicants have not made any representation in the Department for redressal of their grievance. Under these circumstances we permit the applicants to make a detailed representation to the Respondents against the withdrawal of advance increment within a month from the date of receipt of this order. On receipt of such a representation the Respondents are directed to dispose of the same within a period of two months. Till the disposal of the representation of the applicants, any recovery in the light of impugned order dated 30.1.1992 shall remain stayed.

2. If the applicants are still aggrieved after the disposal of their representation, they will be at liberty to approach this Tribunal afresh.

Contd:...2/-

3. Accordingly the O.A. is disposed-of at the admission stage itself with no order as to costs. ✓

455
Deputy Registrar (Jdls.)

Copy to:-

1. The Chairman, Telecom Commission, Union of India, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi-110 001. ✓
2. The Assistant Engineer(HRD), O/O Telecom District Manager, Visakhapatnam-530 020. ✓
3. One copy to Sri. C.Suryanaryana, advocate, CAT, Hyd-bad. ✓
4. One copy to Sri. M.Jagan Mohan Reddy, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd-bad. ✓
5. One spare copy. ✓

Rsm/-

20/9/91

~~MR~~ M.A. 364/92
~~415~~ in
O.A. 252/92

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

THE HON'BLE MR.

V.C.

AND

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

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 16/4/1992.

ORDER / JUDGMENT

E.A./C.A./M.A. No. 364/92

in

O.A. No.

252/92

T.A. No.

(W.P. No.)

Admitted and interim directions
issued

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BENCH

Dismissed for Default.

M.A. Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

656
3/4/92
3/5/92