

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

OA No.949/93.

Dt. of Order:12-8-93.

Kum.G.Lakshmi Padmavathi

.....Applicant

Vs.

1. The General Manager,
SC Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
2. The ~~Chief~~ Personnel Officer,
SC Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
3. The Dy.Chief Mechanical Engineer,
SC Railway, Guntupalli Wagon Workshop,
Guntupalli, Krishna District.

....Respondents

-- -- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri K.Lakshmi Narasimha

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri J.R.Gopal Rao, SC for Rlys

-- -- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHIR A.B.GORTHI : MEMBER (A)

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

(Order of the Division Bench passed by Hon'ble

-- -- -- --

Heard Shri K.Lakshmi Narasimha, learned counsel for the applicant. The grievance of the applicant is against the offer of appointment to her as a Trainee Artisan in Mechanical Department of Wagon Workshop of Guntupalli. The applicant's case is that her father's land was acquired by Railways and that she had to be offered suitable appointment. She is M.A. in Economics

92

and M.A. in Mass Communications. Notwithstanding with 8
her educational qualifications and the fact that she is
a female candidate, respondents ought to have considered
her for employment in any of the clerical posts available
with them. The applicant apprehends that due to her
physical limitations and lack of experience and any
Technical Background, ~~which~~ ^{it} ~~may be any~~ dangerous to ^{her} life
or limb ^{working in} ~~for~~ such jobs as welder/turner/fitter etc.,.

2. Shri J.R.Gopal Rao, standing counsel for Res-
pondents states that the respondents offered the applicant
a suitable job, ^{as} ~~the~~ land of her father was acquired by the
Railways. He further states that there are already some
female candidates working in ^{the} post of Artisan in the
Railways.

3. We find that the application required to be
adjudicated. Accordingly it is admitted. Reply to be
filed within 30 days.

4. On the question of ~~main~~ interim relief we
find that it cannot be in the interest of the applicant
herself if a direction is issued ~~from~~ ~~her~~ stopping
her from reporting for duty as a Trainee Artisan. It would
also not be according to the balance of convenience
if the directions of the respondents to the applicant to
~~are stayed.~~ ^{are stayed.} ~~Concerned~~
~~report for training as Trainee.~~ ^{Concerned} We are however ~~enjoined~~
L

with the apprehension expressed by the applicant that if she undertakes the training related to any of the Technical trades, may result in her physical injury. In these circumstances we direct the respondents to ensure that on the applicant's reporting to duty, she is assigned such task^s as would not cause her ^{any physical} harm or endanger her life or limb. The Respondents may file a short reply within a fortnight on this interim relief. Post the case for orders on 13-9-93. ~~for orders~~

T.C.R.
(T.CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY)

signature
(A.B. GORTHI)

Dated: 12th August, 1993.
Dictated in Open Court.

Deputy Registrar

av1/

To

1. The General Manager, S.C.Rly, Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer, S.C.Rly, Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
3. The Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, S.C.Rly, Guntupalli Wagon Workshop, Guntupalli, Krishna Dist.
4. One copy to Mr. J.R. Gopal Rao, SC for Rlys. CAT.Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm

3rd copy
pvm
12/8/93

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

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

AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 12-8-1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in

O.A.No. 949/93

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.

