

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

R?P. No.36/94.

in

O.A. No.371/93.

DT. of Decision : 27.6.94.

S. Satyanarayana Reddy

.. Applicant

Vs

1. The General Manager,
SC Rlys, Rail Nilayam,
Sec'bad - 500 371.

2. Divisional Railway Manager (BG),
Sanchalan Bhavan, Sec'bad-370.

3. Sr. Divisional Accounts (BG),
SC Rlys, Sec'bad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. R.V. Kameshwaran (*Not present*).

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr. J.R. Gopal Rao, SC for Rlys.

CORAM:

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

..2

2st P.
/

9

R.P.36/94

in

O.A.371/93

Dt. of Order: _____ 94

ORDER

This RP is filed to review our Judgement dated 4.3.94 passed in OA 371/93.

2. OA 371/93 had been filed for a direction to the respondents to refix the terminal benefits like pension, gratuity, by taking into account 55% of the running allowance in the eligible emoluments and accordingly pay the retirement benefits at the enhanced rates along with the arrears from the date of retirement and pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

3. The OA was listed for final hearing on 2.3.94. There was no representation on behalf of the applicant. None were present on 2.3.94. After hearing Mr J.R.Gopala Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents, the OA which was listed for orders on 2.3.94, was ordered to be listed for dismissal on 4.3.94. That day also there was nobody on behalf of the applicant and there was no representation on behalf of the applicant. Mr J.R. Gopala Rao, counsel for the respondents was heard and after perusing the material available on record, the OA was ~~not~~ dismissed on merits holding as under:

".....So, that being the position, the applicant who retired in the year 1987 in a Stationary job as Running Room Inspector, is not entitled to demand for 55% of his pay towards running allowance for calculating retirement benefits. ~~We~~ So, we see no merit in this OA and the OA is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed....."

The present RP is filed to review ~~our above~~ Judgement dated 4.3.94 passed in OA 371/93 as indicated above.

4. The RP was listed for orders on 24/6/94. On 24.6.94 none were present. So, the RP was ordered to be listed for dismissal today i.e. 27.6.94. Today also the position is as it was on 24.6.94. Nobody is present on behalf of the applicant. There is no representation on behalf of the review petitioner.

5. We have perused the records. We find no error apparent on the face of the record that had been committed by us. Absolutely there are no grounds to review our Judgement dated 4.3.94 passed in OA 371/93. Hence, the RP is dismissed. No costs.

T. Chandrasekhara Reddy
(T.CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
Member(Judl.)

Dated: The 27th June, 1994.

(Dictated in the Chambers)

Prabha 6/7/94
DEPUTY REGISTRAR(J)

mvl

Copy to:-

1. The General Manager,
South Central Railway,
Railnilayam, Secunderabad - 500 371.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, (BG),
Sanchalan Bhavan, Secunderabad - 370.
3. Sr. Divisional Accountant, (BG),
South Central Railway, Secunderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. R.V. Kameswaran, Advocate, (~~Not present~~)
12.12-213/3, Behind Mosque, Sithaphalmandi,
Secunderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. J.R. Gopal Rao, SC for Railways, CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One spare copy.

YLKR

302 page
Rz
5/7/94

TYPED BY

COMPILED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE V. NEELAKURTI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. A. G. PRITHI : MEMBER(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER(JUDICIAL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGA RAO : MEMBER(A)

Dated: 27.6.94

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

~~S.A.~~/A.A./C.A. No. 36/94 ✓

in

S.A. No. 371/93 ✓

T.A. No.

(U.C. No. _____)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with Directions.

Dismissed. *RP*

Dismissed as Withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs. ✓

