

7/31/1916

111

111

111

111

111

ANNEXURE - I

List of Papers in Original Application No.

11/93.

Sl.No.Of Papers.	Date of Papers or Date of Filing.	Description Of Papers.
---------------------	---	---------------------------

Part - I

6-1-93.

Original Judgement

O.A. & Material Papers.

Counter.

Reply Counter.

PART - I,

PART -- II,

PART --- III  
Destroyed.

29/4/99.

ANNEXURE - I

List of Papers in Original Application No.

11/93.

Sl.No.Of Papers.	Date of Papers or Date of Filing.	Description Of Papers.
---------------------	---	---------------------------

Part - I

6-1-93.

Original Judgement  
O.A. @Material Papers.  
Counter.  
Reply Counter.

PART - I, PART -- II, PART --- III  
Destroyed.

29/4/99.







( See Rule 114)

OA/ TA - RA / CP / MA / PT ..... of 1993

VER SUS

The Super f Pos, nandyal Division  
Karnal Distt, Aff Law Respondent(s).

Serial No.	Description of Documents	Page

Orders In M.A(s)

Orders in (Final Orders) dr. 6.193  
slan by

2. 8.

Paru II fern bundel ditinggal

Certified that the file is complete in all respects.

Signature of  
Dealing Hand  
(in Record Section).

Signature of S.O.



FORM NO.21

( See Rule 114)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

OA/ TA : RA / CP / MA / PT ..... of 1993

..... A. Venkateswarlu ..... Applicant(s)

versus

..... The Super f. Pos., Nandyal Division ..... Respondent(s).  
Karnool Dist., AP Raur

INDEX Sheet

Serial No.	Description of Documents	Page
	Block Orders.	1-
	Interim Orders	-
	Orders In M.A(s)	-
	Orders in (Final Orders) dr. 6.1.93 slavery	8-8 9-12

..... Pair of fine budi dinge

Certified that the file is complete in all respects.

Signature of  
Dealing Hand  
(in Record Section).

Signature of S.O.

Date	Office Note	Orders



# Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH

(1) (1)

O.A. No./T.A. No. ....

11/1993

A. Venkateswarlu

Applicant (s)

Versus

The Supdt of Post Offices Nandyal Division Kurnool. A.P

Respondent (s)

another

Date	Office Note	Orders
6/1/93		OA is allowed with no order as to cost. Vide the orders on separate sheet.  T. S. R. HCSR 9(5)

(P.T.O.)



# Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH

(8) (1)

O.A. No./T.A. No. ....

11/1993

A. Venkateswarlu

Applicant (s)

The Supdt of Post

Versus

offices, Nandyal Division

Kurnool. A.P.

Respondent (s)

another

Date	Office Note	Orders
6/1/93		<p>OA is allowed with no order as to cost. Vide the orders on separate sheets.</p> <p>T. C. N HCSR 9(5)</p>

(P.T.O.)





---  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

R.A./M.A./C.A No.  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION

11

of 1993

-----  
TRANSFER APPLICATION NO.

-----  
OLD PETN. NO.

CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required to be taken and  
the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided)

Dated: 6/1/93.

Counter signed:

Section Officer/Court Officer.  
pvm

Signature of the  
Dealing Assistant.

---  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

R.A./M.A./C.A No.  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION

11 of 1993

-----  
TRANSFER APPLICATION NO.


-----  
~~OLD PETN. NO.~~

CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required to be taken and  
the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided)

Dated: 6/1/93

Counter signed:

Section Officer  Court Officer.  
pvm

  
Signature of the  
Dealing Assistant.







(23) 3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

D.A.No. 11/93

L.A.No.

Dt. of Decision: 6.1.1993

A.Venkateswarlu

Petitioner

Mr. Krishna Devan

Advocate for  
the Petitioner  
(s)

Versus

The Supdt. of Post Offices, Nandyal Division,  
Kurnool District and another.

Respondent.

Mr. N.V. Ramana

Advocate for  
the Respondent  
(s)

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY, MEMBER (JUD L.)

THE HON'BLE MR.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
  2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
  3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?
  4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?
  5. Remarks of Vice-Chairman on Columns 1,2,4 (to be submitted to Hon'ble Vice-Chairman where he is not on the Bench.)
- No

avl/

J. C. N. P.  
(HTCSR)  
M(J)



(53)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

D.A.No. 11/93

L.A.No.

Dt. of Decision: 6.1.1993

A.Venkateswarlu

Petitioner

Mr. Krishna Devan

Advocate for  
the Petitioner  
(s)

Versus

The Supdt. of Post Offices, Nandyal Division,  
Kurnool District and another.

Respondent.

Mr. N.V. Ramana

Advocate for  
the Respondent  
(s)

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY, MEMBER (JUD L.)

THE HON'BLE MR.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
  2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
  3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?
  4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?
  5. Remarks of Vice-Chairman on Columns 1,2,4 (to be submitted to Hon'ble Vice-Chairman where he is not on the Bench.)
- No

evl/

(HTCSR)

M(J)





(H) (H)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.11/93

Date of Order: 6.1.1993

BETWEEN :

A.Venkateswarlu

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nandyal Division, Kurnool District,  
Andhra Pradesh.

2. The Director General of Posts,  
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. V. Rajeswarar

for

Mr. N. V. Ramana

---

CORAM:

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

---

T. C. N. P.

..2

TSR  
7.1



(H) (H)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.11/93

Date of Order: 6.1.1993

BETWEEN :

A.Venkateswarlu

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nandyal Division, Kurnool District,  
Andhra Pradesh.

2. The Director General of Posts,  
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. V. Rajeswarar

for

Mr. N.V. Ramana

---

CORAM:

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

--- T. S. n. p. ---

..2

TSR  
21/1







Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by  
Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member(Judl.).

---

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to declare that the applicant is entitled to get the daily allowance for the period of training obtained outside the headquarters and pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The facts giving rise to this O.A. in brief are as follows:-

2. The applicant was working as Group 'D' in the Postal Division of Nandyal in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh. The applicant was selected in the examination for promotion to the cadre of "Postal Assistant" in the year 1990. The applicant was deputed to undergo "Induction of P.As training in Banjara Hills Post Office, Hyderabad" as per the orders of the 1st respondent dated 7.2.1991. The applicant actually underwent training at Hyderabad from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991. The respondents have paid only Travelling Allowance to the applicant for performing journey to Hyderabad where the applicant underwent the said training. The applicant was not paid D.A. during the period of training at Hyderabad. The applicant himself had borne all the expenses at Hyderabad during the period of training. The applicant had filed this O.A. for the relief as already indicated above.

3. Today we have heard Mr.Krishna Devan, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.N.V.Kamana, Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. ~~Mr.N.V.Kamana~~ <sup>Mr.N.V.Kamana</sup> Standing Counsel for the respondents vehemently contended that the applicant is not entitled to

T. C. N.



Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by  
Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member(Judl.).

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to declare that the applicant is entitled to get the daily allowance for the period of training obtained outside the headquarters and pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The facts giving rise to this O.A. in brief are as follows:-

2. The applicant was working as Group 'D' in the Postal Division of Nandyal in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh. The applicant was selected in the examination for promotion to the cadre of "Postal Assistant" in the year 1990. The applicant was deputed to undergo "Induction of D.As training in Banjara Hills Post Office, Hyderabad" as per the orders of the 1st respondent dated 7.2.1991. The applicant actually underwent training at Hyderabad from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991. The respondents have paid only Travelling Allowance to the applicant for performing journey to Hyderabad where the applicant underwent the said training. The applicant was not paid D.A. during the period of training at Hyderabad. The applicant himself had borne all the expenses at Hyderabad during the period of training. The applicant had filed this O.A. for the relief as already indicated above.

3. Today we have heard Mr.Krishna Devan, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.N.V.Kamana, Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. ~~Mr. Krishna Devan~~ <sup>Mr. Krishna Devan</sup> Standing Counsel for the respondents vehemently contended that the applicant is not entitled to

T. C. N.











(46) (6)

.. 3 ..

daily allowance for the period of training at Hyderabad as per the Director-General's letter dt. 17.8.1987.

5. Admittedly the applicant had gone to Hyderabad to undergo the said training in pursuance of the proceedings dt. 7.2.1991 issued by the 1st respondent. The fact that the applicant herein had completed training at Hyderabad in pursuance of the said orders of the 1st respondent dt. 7.2.1991 is not in dispute in this O.A. Admittedly while undergoing the said training the applicant should have spent some amount towards boarding and lodging charges. For all purposes it has got to be taken that the applicant was "outside the headquarters on official duty while undergoing the said training". So as the applicant had been on official duty outside the headquarters it will be fit and proper to direct the respondents to pay the applicant the D.A. to which he is entitled in accordance with the rules. No doubt the contention of Mr.N.R.Devraj is that the said D.A. cannot be paid to the applicant in view of the letter dt.17.8.1987 issued by the Director General. But no credence can be given to the said letter as already pointed out as it must be taken for all purposes that the applicant was on "duty" during the said training at Hyderabad. So, he has got to be paid the D.A. as already pointed out in accordance with the rules.

6. Hence, we direct the respondents to reimburse the applicant the daily allowance for which he is entitled in accordance with the rules for the period of training from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991 he underwent at Hyderabad. If any payments had already been made, the same shall be deducted

32/8



.. 3 ..

daily allowance for the period of training at Hyderabad as per the Director-General's letter dt. 17.8.1987.

5. Admittedly the applicant had gone to Hyderabad to undergo the said training in pursuance of the proceedings dt. 7.2.1991 issued by the 1st respondent. The fact that the applicant herein had completed training at Hyderabad in pursuance of the said orders of the 1st respondent dt. 7.2.1991 is not in dispute in this O.A. Admittedly while undergoing the said training the applicant should have spent some amount towards boarding and lodging charges. For all purposes it has got to be taken that the applicant was "outside the headquarters on official duty while undergoing the said training". So as the applicant had been on official duty outside the headquarters it will be fit and proper to direct the respondents to pay the applicant the D.A. to which he is entitled in accordance with the rules. No doubt the contention of Mr.N.R.Devraj is that the said D.A. cannot be paid to the applicant in view of the letter dt.17.8.1987 issued by the Director General. But no credence can be given to the said letter as already pointed out as it must be taken for all purposes that the applicant was on "duty" during the said training at Hyderabad. So, he has got to be paid the D.A. as already pointed out in accordance with the rules.

6. Hence, we direct the respondents to reimburse the applicant the daily allowance for which he is entitled in accordance with the rules for the period of training from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991 he underwent at Hyderabad. If any payments had already been made, the same shall be deducted







from out of the amount that is payable to him in pursuance of this order of this Tribunal. This order shall be implemented within three months from the date of communication of the same. With the above said directions the O.A. is allowed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

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

Dated: 6th January, 1993 Dy. Registrar (Judl.)

(Dictated in Open Court)

Copy to:-

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nandyal Division, Kurnool District, A.P.
2. The Director General of Posts, New Delhi.  
sd
3. One copy to Sri. Krishna Devan, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

*10/2/93  
page 2*



from out of the amount that is payable to him in pursuance of this order of this Tribunal. This order shall be implemented within three months from the date of communication of the same. With the above said directions the O.A. is allowed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

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

Dated: 6th January, 1993 Dy. Registrar (Judl.)

(Dictated in Open Court)

Copy to:-

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nandyal Division, Kurnool District, A.P.
2. The Director General of Posts, New Delhi.  
sd
3. One copy to Sri. Krishna Devan, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

10/12/93  
page 2  
7



R.M. (H)  
13/1/93  
O.A. 11/93

TYPED BY  
IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHECKED BY  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD  
COMPARED BY  
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH: AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. V.C.  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY: M(J)  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER (JUDL)

Dated: 6/1/1992

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in  
11/93

O.A. No.

T.A. No.

(W.P. No.)

Admitted and Interim Directions issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as with drawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

pvm.

9/1/93





R.M. (45)  
13/1/93  
O.A. 11/93

TYPED BY \_\_\_\_\_ COMPARED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
HYDERABAD BENCH  
HYDERABAD

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH: AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. \_\_\_\_\_ V.C.  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY: M(J)  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER (JUDL)

Dated: 6/1/1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

O.A. No.

T.A. No.

in  
11/93  
(W.P. No. \_\_\_\_\_)

Admitted and Interim Directions issued

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as with drawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

pvm.

9/1/93

Central Administrative Tribunal DESPATCH 19 JAN 1993 HYDERABAD BENCH.
--

18 8

5.17

10.17

6.17



Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by  
Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member (Judl.).

---

This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to declare that the applicant is entitled to get the daily allowance for the period of training obtained outside the headquarters and pass such other order or orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The facts giving rise to this O.A. in brief are as follows:-

2. The applicant was working as Group 'D' in the Postal Division of Nandyal in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh. The applicant was selected in the examination for promotion to the cadre of "Postal Assistant" in the year 1990. The applicant was deputed to undergo "Induction of P.As training in Banjara Hills Post Office, Hyderabad" as per the orders of the 1st respondent dated 7.2.1991. The applicant actually underwent training at Hyderabad from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991. The respondents have paid only Travelling Allowance to the applicant for performing journey to Hyderabad where the applicant underwent the said training. The applicant was not paid D.A. during the period of training at Hyderabad. The applicant himself had borne all the expenses at Hyderabad during the period of training. The applicant had filed this O.A. for the relief as already indicated above.

3. Today we have heard Mr.Krishna Devan, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.N.V.Kamana, Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. ~~Mr.N.V. Devan~~<sup>Mr. Krishna Devan</sup> Standing Counsel for the respondents vehemently contended that the applicant is not entitled to

T. C. M. —————

(10)

Order of the Single Member Bench delivered by  
Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhara Reddy, Member (Judl.).

---  
This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act to direct the respondents to declare that the applicant is entitled to get the daily allowance for the period of training obtained outside the headquarters and pass such other order or orders as may seem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The facts giving rise to this O.A. in brief are as follows:-

2. The applicant was working as Group 'D' in the Postal Division of Nandyal in Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh. The applicant was selected in the examination for promotion to the cadre of "Postal Assistant" in the year 1990. The applicant was deputed to undergo "Induction of P.As training in Banjara Hills Post Office, Hyderabad" as per the orders of the 1st respondent dated 7.2.1991. The applicant actually underwent training at Hyderabad from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991. The respondents have paid only Travelling Allowance to the applicant for performing journey to Hyderabad where the applicant underwent the said training. The applicant was not paid D.A. during the period of training at Hyderabad. The applicant himself had borne all the expenses at Hyderabad during the period of training. The applicant had filed this O.A. for the relief as already indicated above.

3. Today we have heard Mr.Krishna Devan, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao for Mr.N.V.Ramana, Standing Counsel for the respondents.

4. ~~Mr.N.V. Devan~~ Standing Counsel for the respondents vehemently contended that the applicant is not entitled to

T c m —————



(9)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.11/93

Date of Order: 6.1.1993

BETWEEN :

A.Venkateswarlu

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nandyal Division, Kurnool District,  
Andhra Pradesh.

2. The Director General of Posts,  
New Delhi.



.. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. V. Rajeswaraka

for

Mr. N. V. Ramana

---

CORAM:

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

---

T. C. R.

..2

TSR  
9.1

9

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.11/93

Date of Order: 6.1.1993

BETWEEN :

A.Venkateswarlu

.. Applicant.

A N D

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nandyal Division, Kurnool District,  
Andhra Pradesh.

2. The Director General of Posts,  
New Delhi.



.. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr. Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. V. Rajeswara

for

Mr. N. V. Ramana

---

CORAM:

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

--- T. C. R. P. ---

..2

15/10  
31/10  
7/11



from out of the amount that is payable to him in pursuance of this order of this Tribunal. This order shall be implemented within three months from the date of communication of the same. With the above said directions the O.A. is allowed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

Date.....

Court Officer

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Hyderabad Bench  
Hyderabad.

Copy to:-

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nandyal Division, Kurnool District, A.P.
2. The Director General of Posts, New Delhi.  
SC
3. One copy to Sri. Krishna Devan, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

Case Number OA 11/93  
Date of Judgement 6-1-93  
Copy made ready on 18-1-93

Section Officer (I)

102-441  
page 9  
7

from out of the amount that is payable to him in pursuance of this order of this Tribunal. This order shall be implemented within three months from the date of communication of the same. With the above said directions the O.A. is allowed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

Date.....  
Court Officer  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Hyderabad Bench  
Hyderabad.

13  
1 53

Copy to:-

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nandyal Division, Kurnool District, A.P.
2. The Director General of Posts, New Delhi.  
SO
3. One copy to Sri. Krishna Devan, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V.Ramana, Addl. CSSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

102-841  
page 2  
7

Case Number OA 11/93  
Date of Judgement 6-1-93  
Copy made ready on 18-1-93

Secretary (I)



daily allowance for the period of training at Hyderabad as per the Director-General's letter dt. 17.8.1987.

5. Admittedly the applicant had gone to Hyderabad to undergo the said training in pursuance of the proceedings dt. 7.2.1991 issued by the 1st respondent. The fact that the applicant herein had completed training at Hyderabad in pursuance of the said orders of the 1st respondent dt. 7.2.1991 is not in dispute in this O.A. Admittedly while undergoing the said training the applicant should have spent some amount towards boarding and lodging charges. For all purposes it has got to be taken that the applicant was "outside the headquarters on official duty while undergoing the said training". So as the applicant had been on official duty outside the headquarters it will be fit and proper to direct the respondents to pay the applicant the D.A. to which he is entitled in accordance with the rules. No doubt the contention of Mr.N.R.Devraj is that the said D.A. cannot be paid to the applicant in view of the letter dt.17.8.1987 issued by the Director General. But no credence can be given to the said letter as already pointed out as it must be taken for all purposes that the applicant was on "duty" during the said training at Hyderabad. So, he has got to be paid the D.A. as already pointed out in accordance with the rules.

6. Hence, we direct the respondents to reimburse the applicant the daily allowance for which he is entitled in accordance with the rules for the period of training from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991 he underwent at Hyderabad. If any payments had already been made, the same shall be deducted

daily allowance for the period of training at Hyderabad as per the Director-General's letter dt. 17.8.1987.

5. Admittedly the applicant had gone to Hyderabad to undergo the said training in pursuance of the proceedings dt. 7.2.1991 issued by the 1st respondent. The fact that the applicant herein had completed training at Hyderabad in pursuance of the said orders of the 1st respondent dt. 7.2.1991 is not in dispute in this O.A. Admittedly while undergoing the said training the applicant should have spent some amount towards boarding and lodging charges. For all purposes it has got to be taken that the applicant was "outside the headquarters on official duty while undergoing the said training". So as the applicant had been on official duty outside the headquarters it will be fit and proper to direct the respondents to pay the applicant the D.A. to which he is entitled in accordance with the rules. No doubt the contention of Mr.N.R.Devraj is that the said D.A. cannot be paid to the applicant in view of the letter dt.17.8.1987 issued by the Director General. But no credence can be given to the said letter as already pointed out as it must be taken for all purposes that the applicant was on "duty" during the said training at Hyderabad. So, he has got to be paid the D.A. as already pointed out in accordance with the rules.

6. Hence, we direct the respondents to reimburse the applicant the daily allowance for which he is entitled in accordance with the rules for the period of training from 11.2.1991 to 3.5.1991 he underwent at Hyderabad. If any payments had already been made, the same shall be deducted