

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.784/94.

Date: 18-6-1994



Between:

S.Thilak Kumar Babu. .. Applicant

and

1. Union of India per General Manager  
South Central Railway Rail Nilayam,  
Secunderabad.
2. Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer  
Carriage Repair Shop, South Central  
Railway, Tirupati, Chittoor District.
3. Work Shop Personnel Officer, Carriage Repair  
Shop, South Central Railway, Tirupati,  
Chittoor Dt. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the applicant: Sri S.Ramakrishna Rao.

Counsel for the respondents: Sri Siva Reddy for respondents.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN, Member (A)

HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR, MEMBER (J)

JUDGMENT:

(per Hon'ble Shri B. S. Jai Parameshwar, Member (J))

Heard Sri S. Ramakrishna Rao, the learned counsel  
for the applicant and Sri Siva Reddy, the learned counsel  
for the respondents.

In O.A.No.859/91 filed by the applicant and  
two others, this Tribunal had directed that in fixing  
the seniority as between the direct recruits and  
promotees, the principle of direct recruits appointed

*D*

in O.A.859/91 is not properly implemented.

With this observation, the O.A., is disposed of. No order as to costs.

इनामित प्रति  
CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

*Pushpendra*

न्यायालय अधिकारी  
COURT OFFICER  
केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
हैदराबाद न्यायर्पाठ  
HYDERABAD BENCH

कानूनी संख्या  
CASE NUMBER O. 859/91  
जज्य का तारीख  
Date of Judgement 18.6.92  
प्रत तथ्यार किया गया दिन  
Copy Made Ready on 21.7.92

न्यायालय अधिकारी (न्य विक)  
Section Officer (S)

below Sri B.Ajay Baby and ~~Smt~~ above Sri N.Karunakaran  
in the grade of skilled Gr.III/ELF as requested in  
Annexure A-5 representations with all consequential  
benefits arising out of it.

We are of the opinion that the present  
O.A., is not maintainable, for, the prayer in this  
O.A., in regard to the fixation of seniority of the  
applicant vis-a-vis the direct recruits is the same  
as prayed for in O.A.859/91. That O.A.859/91 was  
disposed of on 23-6-1993 giving suitable directions.  
Therefore, we feel that the present O.A., is not  
tenable and in case if the applicant aggrieved by  
the impugned order, then he should have filed another  
C.P., or an implementation petition in O.A.859/91.

The position of the applicant in regard  
to his seniority has been fully explained in ~~in~~  
para 8 of the Judgement in O.A.859/91. The  
authorities should comply with or implement the  
directions given in O.A.859/91. We, therefore,  
feel no directions are necessary in this O.A.  
The applicant is at liberty to take such remedial  
measures, if he feels that the judgment ~~is~~

R