IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.259/92

DATE OF ORDER: 25.3.1992

BETWEEN:

I.Nageswara Rao .. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Sub-Divisional Officer,
   Telecommunications,
   Rajahmundry - 533 103.

2. The Telecommunications
   District Manager,
   Rajahmundry - 533 103. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant .. Mr.K.L.Narasimham

Counsel for the Respondents .. Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao fo
Mr.N.V.Ramana Addl CGSC

CORAM:

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

(Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member(Judl.)).

Mr.K.L.Narasimham, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.NV.Ramana, (Addl CGSC for the respondents are present. Heard both sides.

T.C.R.

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents herein to take the applicant into service wherever the work is available.

The facts giving rise to this OA in brief may be stated as follows:

3. According to the applicant he has joined the service with the respondents on 10.8.1985. According to him he is in continuous service from then onwards. It is pleaded in the OA that the service of the applicant had been orally terminated on 1.1.1992. It is the case of the applicant that he has put in more than 240 days of continuous service as on date of termination which is 1.1.1992. According to the applicant the said termination of the applicant dated 1.1.92 is not valid in law. A representation dated 21.1.1992 seems to have been made to the respondents for redressal of the grievance of the applicant. The said representation seems to be undecided yet, by the respondents. In view of this position we are of the opinion that the interests of Justice would be met if this OA is disposed of by giving appropriate direction to the respondents

3. In the result we direct the respondents to decide the representation of the applicant dated 21.1.1992 within 3 months from the date of the receipt of this order and pass final orders there on. If the applicant continues to be aggrieved by the final orders passed there on he will be at liberty to approach this Tribunal in accordance with la

4. After hearing both sides by way of interim measure till the said representation is decided we direct the respondents to re-engage the applicant provided (i) if there is work (ii) if any of the juniors to the applicant are engaged. With the above said directions and interim relief, this OA is disposed of at the admission stage itself. We make no order as to costs.

(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: 25th March, 1992.

(Dictated in the Open Court)

Deputy Registrar (J)

To

1. The Sub-Divisional Officer,
   Telecommunications, Rajahmundry - 533 103.
2. The Telecommunications Dist.Manager, Rajahmundry - 103.
3. One copy to Mr.K.L.Narasimham, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm

sd

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD.

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

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 25 -3-1992.

~~O.A./~~JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 259/92

~~T.A.No.~~

Admitted Interim directions issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

M.A. Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.