

(98)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

OA.282/93

date of decision : 23-7-93

Between

P. Lakshmana Rao : Applicant

and

The Sub Divisional Officer  
Telecommunications  
Palasa  
Srikakulam District

: Respondent

Counsel for the applicant : C. Venkata Krishna  
Advocate

Counsel for the respondent : N.V. Ramana, Addl. SC for  
Central Government

CORAM :

HON. MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON. MR. P.T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (ADMN.)

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, Vice-Chairman)

Heard Sri C. Venkata Krishna, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.V. Ramana, learned counsel for the respondent.

2. The applicant alleges that he was working as Casual Labourer in the office of R-1 from 14-7-1983 and he could not attend to duty from 2-9-1992 as he was taken into

per crime No.54/92 of Ethurallapadu P.S., Srikakulam District. The applicant was released on 14-10-1992 when bail was granted on 13-10-1992. On 17-10-1992 the applicant had given reply to the letter dated 29-9-1992 issued by R-1 requesting him to explain for his absence. It is <sup>the</sup> further

(29)

case of the applicant that he submitted representation/ dated 17-10-1992 and 22-10-1992 before R-1 requesting for reinstatement and the same are not yet disposed of.

Admittedly, the applicant is referred to as one of the accused (A-3) in the Crime No.54/92. Neither of the learned counsel could state as to whether the charge sheet was filed or if filed whether the case was committed to the Sessions Court.

3. The concerned authority is having <sup>power</sup> ~~provision~~ to condone the break in the service of a casual labourer if the circumstances warrant. It is for the concerned authority to consider about the same. Hence, it is just and proper to direct the concerned authority to dispose of <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ representation within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order. If R-1 is not the competent authority to consider, he has to forward this order to the concerned authority.

4. The DA is ordered accordingly. No costs.

P. J. Thiruvengadam  
(P.T. Thiruvengadam)

V. Neeladri Rao  
(V. Neeladri Rao)

Dated : July 23, 93  
Dictated in the Open Court

Deputy Registrar (J)

To

1. The Sub Divisional Officer. Telecommunications.
2. One copy to Mr.C.Venkata Krishna, Advocate, 7-1-571 Subhash Road, Secunderabad.
3. One copy to Mr.N.v.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to ~~ML~~ Library, CAT.Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm

2022/07/23  
7.8.93

URGENT

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

RM

APPROVED BY

28/93

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. EIRUVENGADAM : M(A)

Dated: 23-7-1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A/R.A/C.A.No.

in

O.A.No.

28/93

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

Central Administrative Tribunal

DESPATCH

5 AUG 1993

HYDERABAD BENCH

pvm