

55

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

QA.1125/93

date of decision : 10-9-93

Between

P. Kodandaramaiah : Applicant

and

1. The Chief General Manager
Telecom, AP Circle
Hyderabad 500 001

Telecom, AP Circle
Hyderabad-1

3. The Director (Telegraphic)
AP Circle
Hyderabad-1

4. The Chief Supdt.
Central Telegraph Office
Hyderabad-1 : Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : V. Venkateswara Rao,
Advocate

Counsel for the respondents : N.R. Devaraj, SC for
Central Government

CORAM

HON. MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON. MR. P.T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATION)

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. P.T. Thiruvengadam, Member (Admn.)

Heard Sri V. Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the
applicant and Sri N.R. Devaraj, learned counsel for the
respondents.

To

1. The Chief General Manager, Telecom. A.P.Circle,
Hyderabad-1.
2. The General Manager(Ops) Telecom, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad-1.
3. The Director (Telegraffic) A.P.Circle, Hyderabad-1.
4. The Chief Supdt., Central Telegraph Office,
Hyderabad-1.
5. One copy to Mr.v.venkateswaraRao, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm

3000/HF
P.M. 9/9/13

2. The applicant was initially appointed as Clerk in Central Telegraph Office, Secunderabad. He assumed charge of the Post of Section Supervisor on regular basis at CTO w.e.f. 23-4-1984. By proceedings dated 15-5-1992, the applicant is one of the employees who was declared surplus as Section Supervisor, in the said office at Secunderabad and ~~is~~ ^{was} willing to work in the same capacity elsewhere in the circle ~~as~~ ^{but} asked. He was advised ^{that} otherwise he had to perform operative duties against basic cadre in the same office as TOA(TG). The applicant made out a representation dated 15-6-1992 in regard to the above proceedings.

3. In spite of his representation, by further memorandum dated 19-6-1993, the applicant was once again shown as surplus. Again the applicant submitted a representation dated 15-7-1993 against this proceeding. In the meantime, in the duty charge for the weekend ending dated 11-9-1993, the applicant has been shown the designation of TOA(TG) and had been assigned the duties accordingly. The applicant has applied for leave and has filed this OA praying for setting aside the proceedings dated 15-5-92 and 19-6-93.

4. In the circumstances referred to, we deem it fit and proper to pass the following order :

The applicant had to be continued in the SS Cadre till his representations dated 15-6-1992 and 15-7-1993 are disposed of by the concerned authority.

5. We make it clear that if the applicant is aggrieved by the order that may be passed on his representations, he is free to move this Tribunal if he so desires.

6. OA is disposed of at the admission stage. No costs.

P.T. Thiruvengadam
(P.T. Thiruvengadam)
Member (Admn.)

V. Neeladri Rao
(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated : Sept. 10, 93
Dictated in the Open Court

821/99
Deputy Registrar (J)

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

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

AND

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 10-9 -1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A/R.A/C.A.N.

in

O.A.No. 1125/93.

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.

