

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

MA.472/92-in

DA.354/92 ~~With MA 472/92~~. Date of decision : 5-8-1992

Between

1. C. Umamaheswara Rao
2. S.E. Sekhar Babu
3. T. Satyanarayana Rao
4. B. Venkatramaiah
5. K. Ambaresu
6. V. Manohara Prasad, and
7. G. Nageswara Rao

: Applicants

and

1. State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by

The Chief Secretary
General Administration Department
Secretariat, Hyderabad

2. Union of India, rep. by

The Secretary
Min. of Home Dept. of Personnel Affairs
North Block, New Delhi, and

3. Union Public Service Commission, rep. by its

Secretary
New Delhi : Respondents

Counsel for the applicants : M. Panduranga Rao
Advocate

Counsel for the respondents : D. Panduranga Reddy
SC for AP

N.R. Devaraj
SC for Central Govt.

CORAM :

HON. Mr. R. Balasubramanian, Member (Admn.)

Hon. Mr. C.J. Roy, Member (Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. ~~State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by~~
The Chief Secretary, General Administration Department
Secretariat, Hyderabad. (Govt of A.P.)
2. ~~Union of India, rep. by~~
The Secretary, Ministry of Home Department of Personnel
Affairs North Block, New Delhi. (Govt of India)
3. ~~Secretary, Union Public Service Commission, New Delhi.~~
4. One copy to Sri. M. Panduranga Rao, advocate, High Court
Advocates Associations, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. D. Panduranga Reddy, Sp1. counsel for the
State of A.P.
6. One copy to Sri. N. R. Devaraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
7. One spare copy.
8. One copy to C. J. Ray M(f).

Rsm/-

*copy of
paper*

MA.472/92 is filed in OA.354/92 by seven applicants to join in a single Application.. After hearing both sides Mr. M. Panduranga Rao, learned counsel for the applicants and Mr. N.R. Devaraj and Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy, learned counsel for the respondents, we feel that the MA can be allowed and accordingly MA is allowed.

2. Vide our docket order dated 3-8-92, it is seen that this case is covered by judgement dated 20-1-1992 of this Bench in OA.20/91. This has been confirmed in the counter filed by the State Government. Learned counsel for the Central Government had not disputed the fact. It is understood from both the sides that the Review Committee, which was asked to consider the direction in OA.20/91, has not yet met.

3. Under these circumstances, we dispose of this OA with no order as to costs with the same order contained in the Judgement dated 20-1-1992 in OA.20/91, viz. :-

"In the result, we direct the respondents to consider the case of the applicants for the selection in the list prepared in the year 1987. The review selection committee which was directed to meet within a period of six months from the date of receipt of the order dated 23-12-1991 in the case of OA.442/88 should also consider the case of the applicants herein. If, as a result of the review, the applicants are found fit for inclusion in the select list, they should be promoted to the IAS from the due date and they would be entitled to all the consequential benefits of fixation of pay, seniority etc. except the arrears of pay for the period when they did not work in the higher capacity. The application is disposed of thus with no order as to costs."

R. Balasubramanian
(R. Balasubramanian)
Member(Admn.)

C. J. Roy
(C.J. Roy)
Member(Judl)

Dt. 5th August, 92
Dictated in the Open Court

8/11/89
D. P. Agarwal (Jd)

Perap
TYPED BY

Dee
CHECKED BY

M.A. 472/92
O.A. 354/92

COMPARED BY

C. M. M. 2/92
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: - 1992.

ORDER / JUDGMENT

R.A./C.A./M.A. No. *472/92*

in

O.A. No. *354/92* with M.A. 472/92

T.A. No. (W.P. No.)

Admitted and interim directions
issued

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

M.A. Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

*Q. 11/92
8/8*

