

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

M.A. 732/94  
in RP.SR.No.2189/94  
(RP.No. 91/94.)  
in  
O.A. 136/94.

Dt.of Decision : 10.11.94.

1. Union of India rep. by  
the Secretary to Government,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi - 11.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief  
Army Headquarters,  
DHQ-P.O., New Delhi-11.
3. The Chief Engineer,  
Southern Command,  
Pune - 1.
4. The Chief Engineer R&D Picket,  
Secunderabad - 500 003.

.. Applicants/  
Respondents.

18

Smt. S. Lakshmi Rajyam .. Respondent/  
Applicant.

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

Counsel for the Respondent/  
Applicant : Mr. K.S.R.Anjaneyulu

**CORAM:**

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN  
THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

22

O R D E R

( As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, VC )

Heard Sri N.V. Ramana, and Sri K.S.R. Anjaneyulu, learned counsel for both the parties.

2. The respondent in the OA filed this MA praying for condonation of delay of 90 days in filing the RA.

3. The respondent herein i.e. the applicant in the OA is a Tracer in MES. She filed the OA praying for the same pay scale which is given to Draughtsman Gr.III in CPWD. The said OA was allowed by this Bench at admission stage by following the judgement of Bombay Bench in OA.138/91.

4. It is now stated that Jodhpur Bench in Judgement dated 28-9-1993 in OA.48/92 directed the respondents to consider the case of the applicant therein who is a Tracer in MES in regard to the request for extending the pay scale of Draughtsman Gr.III in CPWD and as per the judgement dated 10-8-1994 in OA.130/93 wherein also similar direction was given, and those requests were rejected and hence this RA was filed.

5. It is not stated for the respondents in the OA that appeal was filed against order in OA.138/91 on the file of Bombay Bench. When this Bench followed the judgement in OA.138/91 on the file of Bombay Bench and when the said judgement had become final, we feel it not a case for reviewing the judgement merely on the basis that another Bench had merely given a direction to the respondent to consider about the extension of benefits to the Tracers in

✓

(23)

MES also.

6. In the result, the MA is allowed, but the RP is dismissed. No costs. /

  
 (R. Rangarajan)  
 Member (Admn.)

  
 (V. Neeladri Rao)  
 Vice Chairman

Dated : November 10, 94  
 Dictated in the Open Court

  
 Dy. Registrar (Jud1)

sk

Copy to:-

1. The Secretary to Government,  
 Ministry of Defence, Union of India,  
 New Delhi-11.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief, Army Headquarters,  
 DHQ, P.O. New Delhi-11.
3. The Chief Engineer, Southern Command, Pune-1.
4. The Chief Engineer R & D Picket,  
 Secunderabad-500 003.
5. One copy to Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. K. S. R. Anjaneyulu, Advocate, CAT, Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyderabad.
8. One copy to Spare.

kku.

 ref: 1  
 Date: 23/11/94