

(A)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

R.A. No. 58/94in
O.A. No. 1162/93.

Dt. of Decision : 6-10-94.

1. Sr. Divl. Personnel Officer,
SC Rly, Vijayawada.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
SC Rly, Vijayawada.

.. Applicants/
Respondents.

Vs

T. Devamma

.. Respondent/
Applicant.

Counsel for the Applicants/
Respondents : Mr. N.R. Devaraj, Sr. CGSC.

Counsel for the Respondent/
Applicant. : Mr. G.V. Subba Rao

Coram;

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.V. HARIDASAN : MEMBER (JUDL.)

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHY : MEMBER (ADMN.)

(13)

R.A. 58/94
in
O.A. 1162/93.

Dt. of Decision : 6.10.94.

ORDER

X+ As per Hon'ble Shri A.B. Gorthi, Member (Admn.) X

This review application has been filed with a request, for a re-consideration of our judgement passed in OA 1162/93. The review applicants herein are the respondents in the OA.

2. The applicant in the OA stated that she was a poor woman belonging to Scheduled Caste (Madiga), and that she had worked as casual mazdoor under the respondents during the period from 1962 to 1965 and again from 1973 to 1977. She approached this Tribunal with a request that her name be entered in the Live Casual Labour Register, so that the respondents could consider her re-engagement. As she had a large family to maintain, a due consideration of her case by the respondents would enable her to earn her livelihood.


3. The OA was disposed of at the admission stage itself, after hearing learned counsel for both the parties. Keeping in view the peculiar circumstance of the case, we took a sympathetic view and condoned the delay in filing the OA and disposed of the OA with a direction to the respondents to enter the name of the applicant in the Live Casual Labour Register, as per extant instructions.


4. In the review application, it is now stated that the applicant in the OA, after having been dis-engaged in 1977, had not bothered to approach the respondents, and that, her contention that she did make a representation on 24.3.87 is not borne out from the record. It is also stated by the review applicants that the applicant in the OA was working as Project Casual Labour and was not on open-line which fact, is stoutly disputed by Shri GV Subba Rao, learned counsel for the applicant in the OA.

R

..3..

5. Having heard counsel for both the parties, and having perused the contents of the review application, we find that there is nothing in the review application, which would necessitate a re-consideration of our order passed in OA 1162/93. Accordingly, the RA is dismissed. No order as to costs.


(A.B. GORTHI)
Member(A)


(A.V. HARIDASAN)
Member(J)

Dated:The 06th October, 1994

Dictated in the open court


Deputy Registrar(Judl.)

mvl

Copy to:-

1. Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, S.C.Rly, Vijayawada.
2. Divisional Railway Manager, S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
3. One copy to Sri. N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. G.V.Subba Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

