

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

D.A. 329/94.

Dt. of Decision : 8.6.94.

P. Yoseb

.. Applicant

vs

1. The Sup-Divisional Officer,
Telecom, Nandyal-518 501.
2. The Telecom Distt. Manager,
Kurnool - 518 050,
3. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom, A.P., (rep. UOI),
Hyderabad - 500 001. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. C.Suryanarayana

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

CORAM:

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

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

25/7/94
E

O.A.No.329/94.

Date of Order : 8.6.94.

Order

X of the Division Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi,
Member(A)]

The Applicant states that he was initially engaged as a casual mazdoor in April, 1981 under the Respondents. He worked as such till March, 1982. Subsequently he was re-engaged in January, 1991 and worked continuously till the end of February, 1994 when his services were disengaged.

2. Heard Shri C.Suryanarayana, learned counsel for the Applicant and Shri -----, learned counsel for the

Respondents. Shri C.Suryanarayana, learned counsel for the Applicant urged that taking into consideration the services rendered by the Applicant as a casual mazdoor under the Respondents, the Applicant acquired certain rights which cannot be denied to him by the Respondents.

3. There can be no doubt as regards the re-engagement of the Applicant from January, 1991 and his continuous engagement till the end of February, 1994. In view of this, we dispose of this O.A. with a direction to the Respondents in the following terms:-


- (1) The name of the Applicant shall be entered in the live casual register.
- (2) He will be engaged as a casual mazdoor whenever there is work in preference to the freshers and juniors.
- (3) The question of granting the Applicant temporary status and his subsequent regularisation will be considered by the Respondents in accordance with the extant rules/instruction.


.....2

2nd P
J

4. Shri N.R.Devaraj, learned counsel for the Respondents disputed the correctness of the age of the Applicant as shown in the cause title. There is no need for us to examine this issue as it is always open for the Respondents to determine the correct age of the Applicant at the time of regularisation.

5. The O.A. is ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.


Member (J).


Member (A).

Dated: June, 1994.
Dictated in Open Court.


DEPUTY REGISTRAR (J)

Copy to:-

1. The Sub Divisional Officer, Telecom, Nandyal - 518 501.
2. The Telecom District Manager, Kurnool - 518 050.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, A.P Circle, Union of India, Hyderabad - 500 001.
4. One copy to Mr.C.Suryanarayana, Advocate, CAT, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC, CAT, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyderabad.
7. One spare copy.

YLKR

3rd page
25/6/94.

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.G.RTHI : MEMBER(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.T.CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY
MEMBER(JUDL)

AND

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

Dated: 8 - 6 - 1994.

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 329/94

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

