

(21)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD.

M.A.NO. 248 of 1993 in O.A.No.92 of 1991.

Between

P.V.Sriramchand

Dated: 22-7-1993.

Applicant

And

1. Secretary to Govt., of India and Director General of Posts, Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General, Andhra Pradesh Circle, Hyderabad.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Sri. K.Sudhakar Reddy
Counsel for the Respondents : Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. A.B.Gorthi, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. T.Chandrasekhar Reddy, Judicial Member

The Tribunal made the following order:-

We have heard Mr. K.Sudhakar Reddy in M.A.No.248/93 and Mr. V.Venkateshwara Rao in RPSR 1573/93 for the petitioners Mr. N.V.Ramana learned counsel for the official respondents also present and heard. In the judgement dated 4-2-1992 in O.A.92/91, the official respondents were directed to reexamine the matter and if the applicant(P.V.Sriram chand) is eligible for the other four vacancies in 1/3rd quota pertaining to the years 1984 & 1986 and if he comes within the selected range by virtue of the marks he has secured in the examination, he should accordingly be accommodated against 1/3rd quota vacancies of the relevant year placing K.Siva Prasad who had secured more marks than the applicant in an appropriate position in the 1/3rd quota. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

The contention of Mr. K.Sudhakar Reddy is that the official respondents have not yet implemented the judgement although more than one year time has elapsed. Obviously, a serious view of the matter has to be taken as regards the failure of the official respondents to promptly comply with our judgement dated 4.2.92. We direct full compliance with the judgement both in letter and spirit within one month from today.

As regards the review petition Mr. V.Venkateswara Rao, contended that as the examination held in 1987 was only for one vacancy of the said year. The review petition^{ers} did not appear for the said examination. Had it been made clear by the official respondents that the examination was held for all the vacancies, the review petition^{ers} could have taken their chance.

Contd:...2/-

(92)

to qualify the said examination. In case the judgement in O.A. No.92/91 is implemented the fear of the review petitioners is that their seniority position would be adversely affected and some of them may even be reverted from the higher posts to which they have promoted in the mean time. As the judgement has not yet ^{been} implemented we cannot at this stage foresee whether the review petitioners would be adversely affected and if so to what extent and in what manner. It is therefore of importance that the judgement in O.A.No.92/91 is implemented first before we can examine the merits of the various issues raised on behalf of the review petitioners. Mr. V.Venkateswara Rao will have the liberty to suitably modify or amend his Review petition in case, it is necessary after the official respondents have implemented the judgements in O.A.92/92. Keep the copy of this order in all the relevant files. M.A.248/93 is disposed of.

R.P. to be registered, if it is otherwise in order and it may be listed for further orders on 24.8.1993.

Oy. Registrar(Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. Secretary to Govt. of India, Director General of Posts, Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General, Andhra Pradesh Circle, Hyderabad.
3. One copy to Sri. K.Sudhakar Reddy, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. V.Venkateswara Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

2nd 16/12/93

IT
C

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

M.A. 248793
in
O.A. 92/91

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN
AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. GORTY : MEMBER (AD)

AND

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. P. T. TIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated : 22/7/1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A. / R.A. / C.M. No. 248793

in

O.A. No.

92/91.

T.A. No.

(w.p.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/ Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

2