

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. Madhu	..	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

UPA 600.

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-Reader, 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.)

CONTD....

28

JUDGMENT

(As per Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvenagadam, 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 complied with and accordingly the impugned orders therein were quashed.

29

: 3 :

they have to submit their objections within the time stipulated.

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

P. J. 2

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

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

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

87983
Deputy Registrar

To

1. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Telecommunications, Peddapalli-172.
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 conv.

pvm

30/9/93

cc by. 8/9/93

TYPED BY *Done* COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY *da* 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

~~RECORDED / TIMING/RENT.~~

M.A/R.A/C.A.N.

in
O.A.No. 1088/93 to 1093/93 (6 cases)
T.A.No. (W.P.)

~~issued.~~

~~Allowed~~

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

