

(19)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No.338/94

Date of Order: 1.4.97

BETWEEN:

1. Ramana
2. Ch.V.Satyanarayana Raju
3. B.V.Ramana
4. Allu Bapaiah
5. M.V.Nageswara Rao .. Applicant.

AND

1. The Sub Divisional Officer, Telecom., Narsipatnam.
2. The Divisional Engineer, Telecom, Anakapalli.
3. The Telecom District Manager, Visakhapatnam.
4. The Assistant General Manager, Telecom, Visakhapatnam.
5. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, Hyderabad. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants .. Mr. K.L.Narasimha
Counsel for the Respondents .. Mr. K.Bhaskara Rao

CORAM:

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

HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (JUD.L.)

JUDGEMENT

X Oral order as per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (Admn.) X

* * *

None for the applicant. Mr.K.BhaskaraRao, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2.



..2

2. There are five applicants in this OA. They ~~are~~ ^{were} engaged as casual labour and their details of the engagement are given from page Nos. 1 - 5 of the OA. The applicants submit that they ~~and hence~~ have completed more than 240 days of continuous service, they are entitled for regularisation in accordance with the guidelines of the Apex Court. They further submit that they have joined service earlier to 31.3.85 and hence they cannot be removed from casual service in view of the memo No. TA/RE/20-2/Rlgs/Corr., dt. 22.2.93 (A-2). The applicants have submitted representation dt. 10.9.93 to R-5 (A-3).

3. This OA is filed praying for a direction to the respondents herein to regularise the service of the applicants in accordance with the guidelines of the Supreme Court and give them temporary status.

4. An interim order has been given in this OA. dt. 23.3.94 That order reads as below:-

"Notice before admission. The respondents are restrained from retrenching the applicants so long as there is work and the Juniors are allowed to continue."

5. No reply has been filed in this connection. Hence it is not known whether the representation of the applicants dt. 10.9.93 has been disposed of or not. The applicants further submit that they ~~are~~ ^{were} engaged earlier to 31.3.85 and hence they cannot be retrenched. As no reply is filed we are not sure of the facts. The applicant, ~~for the applicant~~ ^{were} was also not present

R

D

elucidate

.. 3 ..

~~affidat~~
to ~~illucidate~~ their cases. In view of the circumstances we are of the opinion that only direction that can be given is to dispose of the representation dt. 10.9.93 in accordance with the law confirming the interim order already given dt. 23.3.94.

~~the following direction is given :-~~

The concerned respondents should dispose of the representation of the applicants dt. 10.9.93 taking due note of the averments in this OA as well as letter dt. 22.2.93 of the Telecom Department expeditiously. The interim order dt. 23.3.94 is confirmed.

7. The OA is ordered accordingly. No costs.

B.S. Jai Parameshwar
(B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (Jud1.)
11/19

R. Rangarajan
(R.RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn.)

Dated : 1st April, 1997

(Dictated in OpenCourt)

sd

Ambari
D.R (S) *15m 22*

322
3497

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.R. AGARWAL : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.G. DAI PARAMESHWAR:
M(J)

DATED: 1/4/87

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

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

in

D.A. No. 338/84

ADMITTED INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED
ALLOWED

DISPENSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLR

II COURT

