

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

R.A.No.43/97 in O.A.No.675/97.

Date of decision: 14--8--1997.

Between:

1. V.Ravi Krishna.	16.E.Uma Devi.
2. P.Nagalaxmi.	17. M.Jagath Kumar.
3. P.Nirmala.	18. P.Chandra Sekhar Rao.
4. Elizabeth Christian.	19. P.Yadagiri.
5. A.Nagarjuna Rao.	20. G.Suresh Kumar.
6. K.Koteswara Rao.	21. I.Sai Babu.
7. B.Murali Krishna Murthy.	22. V.Srinivas.
8. C.Karunya.	23. M.Najibur Rahman.
9. T Raghavendra.	24. P.Ranga Sai.
10. G.Kondaiah.	25. Sarwar Baig,
11. T.Susheela.	26. P.Ramanarsing Rao.
12. G.Ramana Reddy.	27. K.Leelavathi Kulkarni.
13. G.Laxmi Prasanna.	28. Y.Koteswara Rao.
14. K. Uma Devi.	29. L.K.Sandhya.
15. K.P.Jalaja Naidu.	30. Ramachander Kulkarni.
	31. N.Janakiram.

Applicants.

1. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Hyderabad City Division at Hyderabad.
2. The Post Master General, Andhra Circle,
Hyderabad 1.
3. The Director General (Postal) New Delhi. 1.

Counsel for the applicants: Sri N.Saida Rao.

Counsel for the respondents: Sri V.Bhimanna.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R. Rangarajan, Member (A)

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

ORDER

(per Hon'ble Sri R. Rangarajan, Member (A)).

for the respondents.

The O.A., was disposed of with the following
direction:

2

D

: 2 :

If ultimately SLP No.8193/93 in C.C.No.20847/93 filed in the Apex Court against the judgment of batch case O.A.No.814/90 and batch are going to be dismissed, the applicants herein also have to be given the same benefits of temporary status and consequential benefits thereon that were granted to applicants in O.A.814/90 and batch case before Ernakulam Bench reported in 1993(23)ATC 822. But, if the said SLP are going to be allowed, this O.A., stands dismissed. If any modified order is going to be passed by the Apex Court, the applicants herein are also entitled to the benefits granted by the modified judgment of the Apex Court."

The applicant in this R.A., now submits that the S.L.P., in the above mentioned O.A.675/94 is not relavent in this case. But we are not sure, what decision is going to be given by the Apex Court in the said ~~case~~ S.L.P. Hence, it is not correct to admit the review petition as the S.L.P., is still pending.

In view of the above, the R.A., is dismissed but opportunity is given to the applicant to file a Review Application, if so advised, after the same is disposed of by the Apex Court.

The Review Application is dismissed. No costs.

B. S. JAI PARAMESHWAR

118 847 MEMBER (J)

R. RANGARAJAN

MEMBER (A)

Date: 14-8-1997.

Dictated in open Court.

sss