

(31)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.49/92

Date of Order: 1.5.1992

BETWEEN :

K.Krishna Reddy

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Union of India,  
rep. by the Director  
General, Telecommunications  
New Delhi.

2. The Chief General Manager,  
Telecommunications,  
Andhra Circle, Hyderabad.

3. The Principal,  
Regional Telecom Training  
Centre, Chandralok Complex,  
Secunderabad.

.. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.J.V.Lakshmana Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.N.Bhaskara Rao

---

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. Reddy*

..2

To

1. The Director General, Telecommunications,  
Union of India, New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,  
Andhra Circle, Hyderabad.
3. The Principal, Regional Telecom Training Centre,  
Chandralok Complex, Secunderabad.
4. One copy to Mr.J.V.Lakshmana Rao, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.N.Bhaskara Rao, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy

pvm

2nd floor  
Date  
15/9/91

(32)

.. 2 ..

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to promote the applicant as Senior Assistant Engineer from <sup>the date of</sup> his 1st Junior promoted with all consequential benefits.

Mr. T.V.V.S. Murthy, Advocate for the applicant and Mr. N. Bhaskara Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents are present. Heard both sides.

During the course of the hearing it was brought to our notice that the departmental enquiry initiated against the applicant as in the year 1987 is still pending and in view of the pendency of the departmental proceeding\$, that the applicant is not being considered for promotion to the higher post. It is also brought to our notice during the course of the hearing that the enquiry had been completed and the report had been submitted by the enquiry officer to the disciplinary authority as early as June, 1991. The disciplinary authority seems to have not yet disposed of the disciplinary matter, pending as against the applicant. So we are of the opinion that the interests of the Justice would be met if the disciplinary authority is directed to dispose of finally the said disciplinary proceeding\$ within 3 months from the date of the receipt of this order and accordingly we direct the disciplinary authority to pass final orders in the disciplinary proceeding\$ pending as against the applicant within 3 months from the date of receipt of this order. With the said directions the OA is allowed. We make no order as to costs.

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

Dated: 1st May, 1992

Deputy Registrar (J)

sd