

(2)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.669/92

Date of Order: 12.8.1992

BETWEEN:

L. Krishna Goud

.. Applicant.

AND

1. The Principal Director of
Commercial Audit and
Ex-Officio Member Audit Board,
Accountant General Office Complex,
Sajifabad, Hyderabad.

2. The Dist. Employment Officer,
Labour, Hyderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. D.P. Kali

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. G. Parameswara Rao
SCT for A.G
and

Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy
Spl Counsel for A.P.State

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.))

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to issue a direction to the 1st respondent to consider the case of the applicant for the post of Group-D (Class IV) after the applicant's name is sponsored by the 2nd respondent i.e., the Dist. Employment Officer, (Labour) in Hyderabad and pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

2. The grievance that is sought to be made out in this OA is, that the District Employment Officer, Hyderabad (Second respondent) had sponsored to the first respondent juniors to the applicant who had registered their names later than the applicants for appointment to Group-D posts. According to the applicant he has registered his name as early as 1988. The case of the applicant is also that the First respondent had notified certain vacancies for Group-D (Class IV) to the Second respondent and that he is fully qualified and eligible for appointment to the said post. So the present OA is filed for the relief as indicated above.

3. This OA came up for admission hearing on 11.8.1992. On 11.8.1992 the counsel for the First respondent Mr. G. Parameswara Rao produced the file concerning the subject in this OA. From the said file it is evident that the notification was made by the First respondent to fill up two vacancies of Attenders Group-D (Class IV) in the Office of the First respondent on 29.7.1992 and that letter is also addressed by the First respondent to Second respondent to sponsor suitable candidate for filling up the said post. A submission was made on 11.8.1992 by Mr. G. Parameswara Rao counsel for the First respondent that the second respondent had not yet submitted the list of candidates for filling up

To

1. The Principal Director of Commercial Audit and Ex-Officio Member Audit Board, Accountant General Office Complex, Saifabad, Hyderabad.
2. The Dist. Employment Officer, Labour, Hyderabad.
3. One copy to Mr. D. P. Kali, Advocate, 2-2-1164/15/B, Tilaknagar, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. G. Parameswara Rao, SC for AG. CAT. Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy, Spl. Counsel for A.P. Govt.
6. One spare copy.

4th 19

pvm.

.. 3 ..

the said posts. In view of the submission made on behalf of the First respondent we directed Mr.D.Panduranga Reddy, Spl. standing counsel for the Second respondent to ascertain the correct position and place the information before this Tribunal.

3. Today Mr.D.Panduranga Reddy has filed a letter that has been addressed to him by the District Employment Officer, Hyderabad. In the said letter it is stated that the list of candidates with regard to the said notification will be proposed to the Employer through the Computer within a short period and after getting the list from the computer only the seniority covered will be informed in due course. So, from the said letter it is quite evident that the Employment Exchange has not yet sponsored the names of candidates in pursuance of the notification of the First respondent dated 29.7.1992. So there cannot be any doubt about the fact that as on today that the applicant does not have any grievance. Hence this OA is certainly premature. Confronted with this position learned counsel for the applicant Mr.D.P.Kali submitted that the applicant is withdrawing from the OA. In view of the representation made by Mr.D.P.Kali that the applicant is withdrawing from the OA, this OA is rejected as withdrawn under the provisions of 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

T. Chandrasekhar
(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: 12th August, 1992

(Dictated in the Open Court)

826892
Deputy Registrar (J)

TYPED BY

(u)

COMPARED BY

P.M.
26/8

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: 12-8 - 1992

ORDER / JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A. No.

669/92

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.

