

(14)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

OA 222/94.

Dt. of Order: 25-11-1994.

N.Prakash

....Applicant

Vs.

1. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory
Project, Min. of Defence, Govt. of India,
Eddumailaram Village, Medak District, AP.
2. Revenue Divisional Officer, Sangareddy,
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, Sangareddy,
Medak District.

....Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri Meherchand Nori

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC
Shri D.Panduranga Reddy,
Spl.Counsel for Govt. of AP

CORAM:

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

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

....2.

15

- 2 -

DA 222/94.

Dt. of Order: 25-11-1994.

(Order passed by Hon'ble Shri A.V. Haridasan, Member (J)).

* * *


The grievance of the applicant Sri M. Prakash is that he has not been provided with a job by the Respondents in the Land Losers Quota. The land belonging to Sri Narasimlu, the father-in-law of the applicant acquired ~~by~~ the Ordnance Factor, Medak. The applicant claims that he is a dependent ~~as~~ on his father in law ~~land~~ and is entitled for employment as per the scheme.


2. In the reply statement, the Respondents stated that one of the dependents i.e. Sri Sathiah has been provided job and therefore another claim is not entertainable.

3. Heard Counsel on either side. The applicant is neither land looser nor a dependent of the land looser. He is only son in law of the land looser. Therefore the applicant has no loco-stande to claim employment in the land losers' quota. Though this vital aspect has not been put forth in the reply statement, we have gone through the allegations in the application and the contents of the reply statement and taken into account the entitlement of the applicant. As the Applicant is ^a ^d ~~total~~ stranger to the land acquired ~~by~~ the Ordnance Factory, being son-in-law of the land looser, ~~that~~ does not confer on him any right to claim any employment as a dependent of the land looser.

.....3.

4. In the light of what is stated in the above paragraphs, we dismiss the application leaving the parties to bear their own costs.


(A.B. GORTHY)
Member (A)


(A.V. HARIDASAN)
Member (J)

Dt. 25th November, 1994.
Dictated in Open Court.

avl/


DEPUTY REGISTRAR(J) 

TO

1. The General Manager, Ordinance Factory Project,
Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India,
Eddumailaram, Medak District.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Sangareddy,
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, Sangareddy, Medak District.
3. One copy to Mr. Mehechand Nori, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. N.V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy, Spl. Counsel for A.P.
6. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One spare copy.

YLKR

OA. 222/94

Typed by
Checked by

Completed by
Approved by

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.A.V.HARIDASAN : MEMBER(3)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.A.B.GORTHY : MEMBER(4)

DATED:

25/11/94

~~ORDER/JUDGMENT.~~

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

O.A.No.

~~I.A.No.~~

in
222/94

Admitted and Interim Directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with Direction.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

no spare copy

