

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

RP 67/93
in
DA 22/93.

Dt. of Order:25-1-94.

1. The Telecom District Manager,
Kurnool,

2. The General Manager, Telecom,
CTO Compound, Sec'bad.

3. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom, Hyd.

4. The Director General, Telecom,
New Delhi.

....Applicants/Respondents

Vs.

1. M.P.Kendhuli

....Respondent/Applicant

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri Krishna Devan

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

...2.

Signature

RP 67/93
in
OA 22/93.

Dt. of Order: 25-1-94.

(Order passed by Hon'ble Shri T.C.Reddy,
Member (J)).

* * *

R.P.67/93 is filed to review the judgment of this Bench dt.8-2-93 passed in OA 22/93. The O.A. was filed by the applicant therein who was working as Selection Grade Transmission Asst. to refix his pay w.e.f. 19-11-92. In the O.A. it had been pleaded that the applicant had been promoted on 28-6-72 from clerical cadre to the ~~max~~ cadre of Transmission Asst. and on completion of 10 years service in the cadre of Transmission Asst. that the applicant was promoted as Sr.Grade Transmission Asst. on 19-11-82. When the R.P. came up for admission today it was brought to our notice that the applicant in OA 22/93 (respondent in RP) had not been promoted as Sr.Grade Transmission Asst. but only had been given the selection grade in the post of transmission Asst. w.e.f. 19-11-82. So as seen the Bench had proceeded on the basis while delivering orders in OA 22/93 as if the applicant in OA 22/93 had been promoted ~~as~~ to the post of Sr.Gr.Transmission Asst.(SGTA) on 19-11-82 and that they had been holding the said post from then onwards. The position as indicated in the judgment.

with regard to the post the applicant held is not correct. This constitutes error apparent on the face of the record. So in view of this position it would be fit and proper to review the judgment dt.8-2-93 passed in OA 22/93 and set aside the same.

2. In the result the judgment dt.8-2-93 in OA 22/93 is reviewed and the same is hereby set aside and OA 22/93 is restored to its file. As there is a factual error in the O.A, Shri Krishna Devan, counsel for the applicant in OA 22/93 seeks time to amend the O.A. suitably. List this O.A. after two weeks for admission. Shri Krishna Devan will be at liberty to take suitable steps to amend the OA in the meanwhile to explain the correct position therein.


(T.CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY)
Member (J)

Dt.25th January, 1994.
Dictated in Open Court.


Deputy Registrar(J)

avl/

To

1. The Telecom District Manager, Kurnool.
2. The General Manager, Telecom, CTO Compound, Secunderabad.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, Hyderabad.
4. The Director General, Telecom, New Delhi.
5. One copy to Mr.N.P.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd
6. One copy to Mr.Krishna Devan, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

*30/1/94
pvc
7.4.94*