

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

O.A. 967/93

Dt. of Decision : 6.4.1994

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. P. Shanker Rao | 17. S. Narsimloo |
| 2. K. Sham Rao | 18. A.K. Chanda |
| 3. M.S.Mallesha | 19. P.J. Wesley |
| 4. R. Sidda Goud | 20. N. Nageshwar Rao |
| 5. M.Mogleshwar Rao | 21. T.H.Munnaiah |
| 6. Abdul Qudduss | 22. C. Anjajah |
| 7. Darbar Singh Gill | 23. Manick Prabhu |
| 8. N. Chandrasekher | 24. B. Jangaiah |
| 9. G. Ramudu | 25. Raja Ram |
| 10. S. Narsing Rao | 26. K. Sampal M. |
| 12. K. Narasing Rao | 27. Akram Khan |
| 13. D. Satyanarayana | 28. L. Narayana |
| 14. C.P.K. Ravichandra | 29. M. Narayan Swamy |
| 15. Koka Narish | 31. V. Narasimha |
| 16. S. Bala Prabhakar Rao | |

.. Applicants.

Vs

1. Director General, D.R.D.O. and Scientific Advisor, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi.
2. Director, Defence Electronic Research Laboratory, Chandrayanagutta, Hyderabad - 500 005.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants :

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI : MEMBER (ADMIN.)
THE HON'BLE SHRI T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY : MEMBER (JUDL.)

8

: 3 :

Copy to:-

1. Director General, D.R.D.O. and Scientific Advisor, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi.
2. Director, Defence Electronics Research Laboratory, Chandrayanagutta, Hyd-005.
3. One copy to Sri. G. Bikshapathy, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

* * *

O.A. 967/93

Dt. of Decision : 6.4.1994

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. P. Shanker Rao | 17. S. Narsimloo |
| 2. K. Sham Rao | 18. A.K. Chanda |
| 3. M.S. Mallesha | 19. P.J. Wesley |
| 4. R. Sidda Goud | 20. N. Nageshwar Rao |
| 5. M. Mogleshwar Rao | 21. T.H. Munnaiah |
| 6. Abdul Qudduss | 22. C. Anjaiah |
| 7. Darbar Singh Gill | 23. Manick Prabhu |
| 8. N. Chandrasekher | 24. B. Jangaiah |
| 9. G. Ramudu | 25. Raja Ram |
| 10. S. Narsing Rao | 26. K. Samba Murthy |
| 11. Shiv Ram | 27. Akram Khan |
| 12. K. Narasing Rao | 28. L. Narayana |
| 13. D. Satyanarayana | 29. M. Narayan Swamy |
| 14. C.P.K. Ravichandran | 30. M. Bhaskara Rao |
| 15. Koka Harish | 31. V. Narasimha |

Vs

1. Director General, D.R.D.O. and
Scientific Advisor,
Ministry of Defence,
South Block, New Delhi.
2. Director, Defence Electronic
Chandrayanagutta,
Hyderabad - 500 005.

..Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr. G. Bikshapathy

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY : MEMBER (JUDG.)

Copy to:-

1. Director General, D.R.D.C. and Scientific Advisor, Ministry of Defence, South Block, New Delhi.
2. Director, Defence Electronics Research Laboratory, Chandrayanagutta, Hyd-005.
3. One copy to Sri. G.Bikshapathy, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

19/11/82

C.A.967/93

Dt. of decision 6-4-1994

Judgement

{ As per the Hon'ble Sri. A.B. Gorthi, Member (Admn.)

The relief claimed by the applicants is for payment of Over Time Allowance (OTA for short) to them w.e.f. 6-11-73 upto July, 1983. The main ground on which the relief is claimed is that they are entitled to OTA for working beyond 44½ hours a week.

2. The respondents in their reply affidavit have stated that for Non-industrial staff, as the applicants herein are, the working hours per week are 48 hours (8 hours a day for six days a week), and hence the applicants are not entitled to OTA for working beyond 44½ hours a week.

3. As none was present for the applicants on 4-4-94, ^{when} and this case came up for hearing, ^{it} It was listed for dismissal today. Now, learned counsel for applicants

in the OA that the applicants were required to work only upto 44½ hours per week, and not 48 hours per week. In view of this, we must accept what has been stated by the respondents in their counter affidavit. ^{Consequently} Secondly, we find that the application is without merit. The same is hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

(T. Chandrasekhara Reddy)
Member (Judl.)

(A.B. Gorthi)
Member (Admn.)

Dictated in Open Court
Dt.6-4-1994

kmv

Prabhu Singh
By Registrar (Judl.)

(contd --- 3) -