

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

OA 1/94.

Dt. of Order: 6-1-94.

(32)

Venkatanna Kompanna

vs.

...Applicant

1. The General Manager,
SC Rlys, Sec'bad.
2. The Divisional Railway
Manager (MG),
SC Rlys, Sec'bad.

...Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri S. Lakshma Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.R. Devudu, Sec'bad

-- -- --

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI T.CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY : MEMBER (J)

-- -- --

....2.

34
O.A.NO.1/94

INTERIM ORDERS

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

Heard the learned counsel for both the parties. Admit. Reply to be filed within 30 days. On behalf of the respondents, S.C.Railway letter No.P(T)694/GM/PNM/SANGH/IXI-14, dated 29.12.1993 has been shown to us. This is the order of the AGM to the effect that the appeal of the applicant against his reversion was rejected.

2. Consequent to the reversion to the post of Junior Signaller, the applicant would not be entitled either to become Goods Clerk or to take the examination/viva-voce for promotion from Goods Guard to Passenger Guard.
3. A perusal of the record before us indicates that the applicant was initially promoted with effect from 6.1.1988 to the post of Senior Signaller from which post he opted to become Goods Guard. His option seems to have been accepted as would be evident from the fact that he was sent for training as Goods Guard and was also given appointment in that post. While he was working as Goods Guard, the order dated 8.3.1991 reverting him from the post of Goods Guard to the post of Junior Signaller was issued. We wanted to know whether during this long period between 1988 and 1993 whether any other individual junior to the applicant was taken as Goods Clerk or was promoted as Senior Signaller. This information is not readily forthcoming from the respondents. In view of the circumstances, we deem it just and proper to direct the respondents, as an interim measure, to allow the applicant to appear for the viva-voce scheduled to be held on 8.1.1994 or on subsequent dates. The result

H
contd....

.. 3 ..

in his case would, however, be not disclosed until further orders.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant states that the S.C.Railway letter dated 29.12.1993 has not been given to the applicant. A copy of the letter may be given to the applicant's counsel for taking suitable steps in accordance with law. Post the case for orders on 16.2.1994.

T. Chandrasekhar Reddy
(T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)
MEMBER (JUDL.)

A. B. Gorthi
(A. B. GORTHI)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

DATED: 6th January, 1994.
Open court dictation.

vsn

Stott
Deputy Registrar (Judl.)

Copy to:-

1. The General Manager, South Central Railway, Sec'bad.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager (MG), S.C.Rlys, Sec'bad.
3. One copy to Sri. S.Lakshma Reddy, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. ~~N R Devanay~~ SC for Rlys, CAT, Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

TYPED BY

01/1/94
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD

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

AND

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER(J)

AND

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

Dated: 6/1/1994

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A./P.A./C.A. No.

O.A. No.

in
1/94

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.

pvm

