

16

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD  
\* \* \*

O.A. 17/94

Dt. of Decision : 31.3.1994

P. Poornachandra Rao

.. Applicant

Vs

1. The Assistant Director General (CW),  
Government of India, Ministry of  
Telecommunications, Department of  
Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan,  
New Delhi.
  2. The Superintending Engineer, Telecom  
Civil Circle, Chikkadapally,  
Hyderabad.
  3. The Superintending Engineer, Postal  
Civil Circle, 3rd Floor, Mahatre Building,  
Dadar, Bombay - 400 028.
- .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao  
Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.R. Devaraj, Sr. CGSC

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY : MEMBER (JUDL.)

..2.

O.A. 17/94

Dt. of Decision : 31.3.1994

ORDER

X As per Hon'ble Shri A.G. Gorthi, Member (Admn.) X

The applicant has filed this OA apprehending that he would be reverted from the post of Head Clerk which he is now holding in the office of the Telecom Civil Division at Tirupati. The reason for his

the civil wing of the <sup>Post</sup> and Telecom in-to separate civil wings, Some of the employees who did not opt for the postal wing may have to be readjusted in the Telecom Wing

from the post of Head Clerk. The office memo dt. 9.6.93 laying down the guidelines for the bifurcation which came into effect from 1.4.1993 is at Annexure - I to the application.

2. Heard learned counsel for both the parties. Mr. K.Venkateswara Rao learned counsel for the applicant reiterating that due to the fact that a certain number of officials did not opt for transfer to the postal wing, they have to be readjusted in the Telecom Wing and that this is bound to affect the present position of the applicant.

3. Mr. N.R. Devaraj learned senior standing counsel for the respondents produces before us a letter from the Ministry of Communication, Department of Telecom, New Delhi dt. 25.2.1994 addressed to the Superintending Engineer (Civil), Department of Telecommunication, Hyderabad.

The said letter is to the effect that "there is no such proposal for the present for making promotion in postal unit wing from the W.C. Gr.I who had opted for Absorption". Consequently the contention of the respondents is that the present OA is premature and that "there is no cause for worry".

4. In the view of afore stated, we are of the considered view that the OA is premature and the same is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly, dismissed.

The interim order dt. 11.1.1994 <sup>directly stating that is</sup> ~~stays~~ vacated with immediate effect. No order as to costs.

(T. CHANDRASEKHARA REDDY)  
MEMBER (JUDGE)

(A.B. GORTNI)  
MEMBER (ADMIN.)

Dated : The 31st March 1994  
(Dictated in Open Court)

Deputy Registrar (J)CC

spr

1. The Assistant Director General (CW),  
Govt. of India, Ministry of Telecommunications,  
Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi.  
2. The Superintending Engineer, Telecom,  
Civil Circle, Chikkadapally, Hyderabad.  
3. The Superintending Engineer, Postal Civil Circle,  
Mahatre Building, Dabar, Bombay-28.  
4. Copy to Mr.K.venkateswara Rao, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.  
5. Copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.  
6. Copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.

151  
TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED 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. A. B. GORTHY : MEMBER (AD)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. TCCHANDRASEKHAR REDDY  
MEMBER (JUDL)

AND

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

Dated: 31-3 -1994

~~ORDER~~ JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No.

17/94

T.A.No.

(w.p.)

Admitted and Interim Directions  
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

pvm

