

92

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

D.A. No. 1293/94.

Dt. of Decision : 21.10.94.

Bheem Raj

.. Applicant.

Vs

1. The Sub Divisional Officer,
Phones, Nizamabad.
2. The Telecom District Engineer,
Nizamabad.
3. The Chief General Manager,
Telecommunication,
Doorsanchar Bhavan,
Hyderabad.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. K.VENKATESWARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.R.DEVARAJ, Sr.CGSC.

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

PJ

O.A.No.1293/94.

Date: 24.10.1994.

J U D G M E N T

I as per Hon'ble Sri R.Rangarajan, Member(Administrative) I

Heard Sri K.Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.R.Devaraj, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.


2. The applicant pleads that he was initially engaged as Casual Mazdoor under the control of the respondents with effect from 13.10.1983 to 30.11.1984 and thereafter he was engaged periodically i.e. from 1.1.1985 to 31.3.1985; 1.3.1986 to 30.6.1986; from 1.12.1987 to 31.3.1988 and lastly from 1.3.1989 to 31.5.1989. Thereafter his services were terminated and later he was not re-engaged. This OA has been filed praying for a declaration that the applicant is entitled for reengagement as Casual Mazdoor under the control of Telecom District Engineer, Nizamabad ~~in terms~~ of the instructions issued by the Director General, Telecommunication and also as per the Lr.No.TA/LC/1-2/III dt. 21.10.1991 and Lr.No.TA/RE/Rlgs./Corr. dt. 22.2.1993 issued by R-3, by holding that the action of the respondents in not reengaging him as illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India.


3. As per the details given by the applicant, he was not engaged after 31.5.1989 for any considerable period. Hence, the question of condoning the break does not arise. As such, he is not eligible to claim seniority on the basis of his earlier service in different spells.

4. In view of what is stated by the applicant, it has to be presumed that he had gained some experience in the work in the Telecom Department. So, it is in the


interest of the department, if he is engaged in preference to a fresher whenever work is available. So, ~~only~~ the ~~only~~ relief that can be granted is to direct the 2nd respondent to re-engage the applicant as Casual Mazdoor in preference to freshers whenever there is work. If the applicant is going to be engaged in pursuance of this order, none shall be retrenched who are already in service.

5. The OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage itself. No costs. /


(R. Rangarajan)
Member (Admn.)


(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated 21 October, 1994.


Deputy Registrar (J) CC

Grh.

To

1. The Sub Divisional Officer, Phones, Nizamabad.
2. The Telecom District Engineer, Nizamabad.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunication, Doorsanchar Bhavan, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. K. Venkateswar Rao, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. N. R. Devraj, Sr. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

J. R. Rao
27/10/94

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

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

AND

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

DATE: 21-10-1994

~~ORDER~~/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 1293/94.

(T.A.No.

(W.P.NO

)

Admitted and Interim directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

Ordered/Rejected

No order as to costs.

no spare copy

[Signature]
27/10/94

Central Administrative Tribunal
DESPATCH
-4NOV1994
HYDERABAD BENCH.

pvm