

(30)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

DA 226/93.

Dt. of Order: 16-1-95.

1. P.Suri Babu
2. V.Sreenivasa Rao
3. P.Gangadhar
4. K.Veerubabu
5. R.Appa Rao
6. A.Dayasagar
7. Ch.Surya Chandra Rao
8. P.Bhavani

.. Applicants

Vs.

1. Chief General Manager, Telecom,  
Hyderabad-500 001.
2. Director (Telegraph Traffic),  
A.P., Telecom, Hyd-1.
3. Senior Superintendent (Telegraph Traffic),  
Visakhapatnam Division, Visakhapatnam-20.

.. Respondents

--- --- ---

Counsel for the Applicant : M/s M.P.Chandramouli  
K.Janardhana Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Bhimanna, Addl.CCSC

--- --- ---

CORAM:

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

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

--- --- ---

... 2.

OA 226/93.

Dt. of Order: 18-1-95.

(Order passed by Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi,  
Member (A) ).

\* \* \*

The applicants are the part time casual workers who worked in the various offices under the control of the Sr. Superintendent (Telegraph Traffic), Visakhapatnam Division. Their claim in this Original Application is for a direction to the Respondents to continue them as part-time casual workers and to consider their cases for grant of temporary status and subsequent regularisation. Similarly situated employees approached this Bench of the Tribunal in OAs 912/92 and 961/92, which was decided by a full bench of the Tribunal vide order dt.7-6-93. The Respondents preferred Special Leave Petition before the Supreme Court against the said order and there is an order of stay issued by the Supreme Court suspending operation of ~~the~~ order dt.7-6-93.

2. Heard learned counsel for both the parties. In the circumstances of the case, counsel for both the parties stated that the Original Application may be disposed of with a direction to the Respondents to give the benefit, if any, of the Supreme Court Judgment to the applicants herein also. Shri M.P.Chandramouli, learned counsel for the applicant states that similar direction was given by this/Tribunal in OA 1031/91.

32

- 3 -

3. In view of the aforesated <sup>42</sup> O.A. is disposed of with a direction to the Respondents that on receipt of the judgment of the supreme court in the aforesated special leave petition, the benefit of the such judgment shall be <sup>extended</sup> ~~given~~ to the applicants herein also.

4. The Original Application is ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

*.....*  
(A.B.GORTHI)  
Member (A)

*.....*  
(A.V.HARIDASAN)  
Member (J)

Dt. 18th January, 1995.  
Dictated in Open Court.

*Arif*  
Deputy Registrar (J)

av1/

Copy to:-

1. Chief General Manager, Telecom, Hyderabad-001.
2. Director (Telegraph Traffic), A.P., Telecom, Hyd-1.
3. Senior Superintendent (Telegraph Traffic), Visakhapatnam Division, Visakhapatnam-20.
4. One copy to Sri. M.P.Chandramouli, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. V.Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

DA:226/93  
TYPED BY  
CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY  
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN : MEMBER(C)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.A.B.GORTHI : MEMBER(A)

DATED : 12/1/93

ORDER/JUDGEMENT.

M.A/R.P/C.P.No:-

O.A.N.C.

in  
226/93

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued

Allowed

Disposed of with Directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

N.S.Patel

Y.L.K.

