

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

C.P.No. 97/97 in

C.P.No. 59/97 in

O.A.No. 477/93

Date of Order : 26.2.98

BETWEEN :

1. Velveti Venkata Subrahmanyam
2. Kelli Chalapathy Rao
3. Maddali Surya Rao
4. Nunna Singaraiah
5. Vendra Rajendra Prasad
6. Shaik Mahabooob Vali
7. Alladi Surya Chandra Prakash Rao
8. Karri Sathi Reddy
9. Kaki Venkata Ratnam
10. Taninki Venkata Narasayya
11. Didla Ratna Raju
12. Gubbala Satyanarayana
13. Gokeda Venkata Rao
14. Muradini Venkateswara Rao
15. Yerasani Anjaneyulu
16. ~~Parulla Rama Rao~~
17. Kandukuri Srinivasa Rao
18. Dhulipala Subba Rao
19. Channa Brahmaji Rao
20. Muthya Satyanarayana
21. Chittapetula Prasad Rao
22. Namburi Vandanaamma
23. Kodati Narayana Rao
24. Nappidi Munnayya

.. Applicants.

AND

1. Sri Montak Singh Ahluwalia,
The Govt. of India, rep. by its
Secretary, M/o Finance Dept. of
Economic Affairs, New Delhi.
2. Sri A.K. Gokak,
~~The Director General~~, Department
3. Sri M.V. Bhaskar Rao,
The Chief General Manager,
Telecom, A.P., Hyderabad.
4. Sri S.V. Nagakumar,
The District Manager, Telenbopas.

R

.. 2 ..

Counsel for the Applicant
Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.S.Chandra Sekhar
.. Mr.V.Bhimanna

- - -

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN ; MEMBER (ADMN.)

HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR ; MEMBER (JUDL.)

- - -

O R D E R

(As per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (Admn.))

- - -

None for the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the order in the OA has not been fully complied with as they have not paid the arrears right from the date of the issue of the letter by the dependent certificate issued by the District Collector in the year 1990. The direction in the OA.477/93 was given based on the order of this Bench in OA.433/87. We have read both the orders. The respondents are to take a decision in this regard on the basis of the various observations made in those OAs. The respondents have come to the conclusion that on the basis of the observation the applicants are entitled for HRA only from a prospective date i.e. September of this year. Hence it cannot be said that the respondents have not complied with the direction. If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision taken it is for him to initiate such proceedings as available to him under law.

3. The C.P. is closed. No costs.

(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (Judl.)

26.2.98

(R.RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn.)

Dated : 26th February, 1998

(Dictated in Open Court)