

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.14/97

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1231/93

Between :-

1. P.Vasudev	8. V.Ramamurthy
2. G.Pattabhi	9. N.Gavararaju
3. T.Ijjayya	10.P.Appa Rao
4. B.Parusuram	11.B.Kumaraswamy
5. I.Suri	12.T.Sinkanna
6. Ch.Suryanarayana	13.Appalaswamy
7. Ch.Narasimhappadu	

... Applicants

And

1. Railway Board, represented by its Chairman, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, SE Rlys, Garden Reach, Calcutta - 700043.
3. Divisional Railway Manager, SE Rlys, Visakhapatnam-4.
4. Permanent Way Inspector, SE Rlys, Naupada, Srikakulam Dist.

... Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri P.B.Vijaya Kumar

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Bhimanna, SC for Rlys

-- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A) ).

R

D

....2.

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A) ).

Heard Shri Pathrudu for Shri P.B.Vijay Kumar, for the applicants. Shri NR Devaraj, standing counsel for the respondents. Original Application No.1168/93 was disposed of by dismissing the same by order dt.6-12-93. The main point that was considered in that O.A. was whether the applicants had submitted their representation for entering their names in the supplementary live register before the prescribed date. After going through the records and also after hearing the learned counsel, this Bench came to the conclusion that there is no record of proof that the applicants had applied within the stipulated date for registering their names in the supplementary live register.

2. This R.A. is filed by the applicants and it is reported that they have filed their representations. But even in this R.A. no satisfactory proof is provided. In the absence of any satisfactory proof that the applicants had submitted their applications for inclusion of their name in the supplementary live register, no direction can be given. Hence this R.A. is liable to be dismissed.

3. However, the applicants are free to check whether their names are entered in the supplementary live register or not and produce satisfactory proof which will satisfy the respondents that they have submitted their application within stipulated period for inclusion of their name in the supplementary live register. Then the respondents may take action as deemed fit.

R

D

....3.

- 3 -

4. The R.A. is dismissed with the above observations.

No order as to costs.

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

28/2/97

  
(R.RANGARAJAN)  
Member (A)

  
D.R.(J)

Dated: 28th February, 1997.  
Dictated in Open Court.

copy  
28/4/97

TYPED BY  
COMPIRED BY

CHECKED BY  
APPROVED BY

THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN: M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S. SAI PARAMESHWAR: M(J)

DATED: 28/2/87

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

R.A./C.P/M.A. No. 14/87

O.A. No. 1231/83 <sup>in</sup>

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED  
ALLOWED  
DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS  
RA  
DISMISSED  
DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN  
ORDERED/REJECTED  
NO ORDER AS TO COSTS.

II COURT

YLKR

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक विधिवलय  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
प्रेषण/DESPATCH

13 MAR 1987

हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ  
HYDERABAD BENCH