

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NOS. 1088/93, 1089/93,
1090/93, 1091/93, 1092/93 and 1093/1993.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 7th September, 1993.

BETWEEN:

Mr. V. Subrahmanyam	..	Applicant in OA 1088/93
Mr. Md. Amzad Ali	..	Applicant in OA 1089/93
Mr. M. Adam,	..	Applicant in OA 1090/93
Mr. N. Syamsundara Rao	..	Applicant in OA 1091/93
Mr. D. Rajaram	..	Applicant in OA 1092/93
Mr. M. Madhu	..	Applicant in OA 1093/93

AND

1. The Sub Divisional Officer,
Telecommunications,
Peddapalli-505172.
2. The Telecom District Engineer,
Karimnagar-505050.

the Chairman,
Telecom Commission,
New Delhi-110001.

.. Respondents in all the OAs

HEARD:

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS: Mr. C. Suryanarayana, Advocate
in all the OAs.

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. V. Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC for
the respondents in OAs 1088/93,
1089/93, 1092/93 and 1093/93

Mr. N. V. Response Reddy, Addl. CGSC
1090/93 and 1091/93.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI P. T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (ADMN.)

CONFID....

JUDGMENT

(As per Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member(Admn.))

..

The applicants have been working as Casual Labour in the Telecom Department. By the impugned orders served on the applicants on 3.8.1993/6.8.1993, their services have been terminated with one month's notice. It has been alleged that the applicants had sought reengagement as casual labour based on production of forged and false casual labour certificates in relation to the period they served with the Department earlier. Inquiries were conducted against the applicants wherein they participated. It is submitted for the applicants that a copy of the Inquiry Officer's report was not served on them before issue of the termination notices and also the respective disciplinary authority figured as witness in the respective inquiries.

2. Similar issues had fallen for consideration in O.A. No.988/93 and batch. We held therein that the inquiries are not of natural justice have not been complied with and accordingly the impugned orders therein were quashed.

4. For the reasons stated therein, the impugned termination orders in these OAs are also quashed. But, it is left open to the second respondent to approach the disciplinary authority who is of the rank equal to or above the first respondent, if it is intended to proceed further with the inquiries and in such a case, it is necessary for disciplinary authority to issue a show-cause notice by enclosing the copy of the inquiry officer's report by informing the

... they intend to challenge the findings therein,

they have to submit their objections within the time stipulated.

4. The O.A. is ordered accordingly. No costs.

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

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

Dated: September 7, 1993.
(Dictated in open court)

A 87/9/83
Deputy Registrar

To

1. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Telecommunications,
Peddapalli-177.
2. The Telecom District Engineer, Karimnagar-050.
3. The Chairman, Union of India, Telecom Commission, New Delhi-1.
4. Six copies to Mr.C.Suryanarayana, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.v.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.N.v.Raghava Reddy, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm

219/93.

cc by. 8/9/93

TYPED BY

COMPALED 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. TIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated: 7-9-1993

CORDED ATTACHMENT.

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

in

O.A.No.

T.A.No.

1088/93 to 1093/93 (6 cases)
(W.F.)

Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

