

10

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD  
---

O.A. No. 875/94.

Dt. of Decision : 13-9-94.

1. Ch. Rama Rao

2. K. Uma Maheshwar Rao

.. Applicants.

Vs

1. The Ordinance Factories Board,  
Govt. of India, 10-A, Auckland Road,  
Calcutta, rep. by its Secretary.

2. The General Manager,  
Ordinance Factory Project,  
Ministerial Defence,  
Eddumailaram, Govt. of India,  
Medak District.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants : Mr. D. Madhava Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

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

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


O.A.NO.875/94.

JUDGMENT

Dt: 13.9.94

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI A.V.HARIDASAN, MEMBER (JUDICIAL))

*The* Two applicants in this case appeared for a selection process for appointment to the post of Supervisor (Technical/Electronics) pursuant to a notification made in the year 1991. Their grievance is that the result of the selection process is unduly and unnecessarily withheld. It is alleged in the application that in OA 1191/91 filed by one of the candidates by name ~~Shri~~ K.Usha Rani challenging the validity of the selection, an interim order was issued directing that the selection and appointment if made, would be subject to the out-come of that application and that that direction does not call for keeping in abeyance the selection and appointment. Hence, the applicants pray that the respondents may be directed to publish and declare the results of the selection of Supervisor (Technical/Electronics) and to make appointments accordingly.

2. The respondents have not yet filed any reply statement. Shri V.Rajeswara Rao, Proxy Counsel for Shri N.V.Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents did not finalise the selection and make appointments only on account of the interim order issued in OA 1191/91. Since 

contd....


*and p. 12*

*[Handwritten marks]*


(12)

.. 3 ..

the interim order in OA 1191/91 is only to the effect  
be subject to the ~~result of the~~ outcome of the result  
of the OA and <sup>that</sup> as the candidates might be ~~advised~~ ✓  
advised, we are of the considered view that there is  
no need or justification for keeping <sup>the</sup> selection process  
in abeyance. Hence, the application is disposed of  
at the admission stage itself directing the respondents  
to declare the results and to make appointments accor-  
dingly making <sup>or</sup> known to the appointees that their  
appointments would be subject to the result of the  
OA 1191/91. With the above direction, the application  
is disposed of. No order as to costs.

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

  
(A.V. HARIDASAN)  
MEMBER (JUDL.)

  
DATED: 13th September, 1994. Dy. Registrar (Judl.)  
Open court dictation.

vsn

Copy to:-

1. Secretary, Ordnance Factories Board, Govt. of India,  
10-A, Auckland road, Calcutta.
2. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory Project, Ministeri  
Defence, Eddumailaram, Govt. of India, Medak District,
3. One copy to Sri. D. Madhava Reddy, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
4. One copy to Sri. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

306 pcy  
Rm 22/9/94

OA-875/94

Typed by  
Checked by

Compared by  
Approved by

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

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

AND

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

Dated: 13/9/94

ORDER/JUDGMENT.

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

O.A.NO.

in  
875/94

T.A.NO.

(W.P.NO.)

Admitted and Interim Directions  
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with Directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

NO SPARE COPY

YLKR

