

(21)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD.

* * *

O.A. 411/94

Dt. of Decision : 8.4.1994.

M. Prasada Rao

.. Applicant.

Vs

Secretary, Ministry of Posts
Department of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi-110 001.

2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom, Door Sanchar Bhavan,
Nampally Station Road,
Hyderabad - 500 001.

Guntur.

4. The Telecom District Engineer,
Ongole.

5. The Sub-Divisional Officer,
Telecom, Chirala - 523 155. .. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. P. Rathaiyah

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N. V. Ramana, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

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

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

O.A.No. 411/94

Dt. of decision: 8-4-1994

Judgement

| As per the Hon'ble Sri A.B. Gorthi, Member (Adm.) |

The applicant who was working as a casual mazdoor under the sub divisional officer telecom Chirala is aggrieved by the order of the respondents disengaging his services w.e.f. 1-1-94. His prayer is that he may be reengaged and considered for grant of temporary status and subsequent regularisation against a Group-D vacancy after condoning the break.

2. The applicant states that he was initially engaged under SDOT, Chirala as a Casual Mazdoor during January, 1983 to May, 1985. Thereafter he was once again engaged as a Casual Mazdoor under SDOT, Chirala from May, 1985. On the basis of his service as Casual Mazdoor under the respondents, he now claims that he should not have been disengaged but continued to work as Casual Mazdoor.

respondents stated that it would be very difficult for the department to verify the fact of the applicant having worked during 1983-85 under SDOT, Chirala. Even the documents produced by the applicant in support of his claim cannot be got verified at this belated stage.

4. Mr. P. Rathaiah, learned counsel for the applicant urges that in view of the fact that the relevant documents in support of the applicant's claim for having worked during 1983-85 have been annexed to the OA, the same should be duly considered by the respondents.


93


5. In the application there is nothing to justify as to why the applicant kept quiet for a long period of about eight years after his initial engagement under the SDOT, Chirala. If the fact of previous engagement of the applicant has got to be taken consideration, it would upset the seniority position of the casual mazdoors working continuously at present. As the applicant himself is guilty of inaction for a long period of about eight years, we hold ~~him to claim the benefit~~ of his previous service during 1983-85.

6. There is no dispute that the applicant was once again engaged under SDOT, Chirala from January 1983 to May 1985. Keeping in view this fact, the case of the applicant deserves to be considered for fresh engagement if there is work, in preference to juniors/freshers. Consequently we dispose of this application at the admission stage itself with the following directions to the respondents.

- (a) The name of the applicant shall be entered in the Live Casual Labour register.
- (b) The applicant will be reengaged as and when there is work in preference to juniors/freshers.
- (c) The applicant's case for grant of temporary status and subsequent regularisation against Group-D post will be considered in accordance with the extant scheme/instructions.

7. No order as to costs.


(T. Chandrasekhara Reddy)
Member (J)


(A.B. Gonthi)
Member (A)

Dt. 8-4-1994
Open Court Dictation


Deputy Registrar (J) CC.

To

1. The Secretary, Min.of Communications, U.O.I. Dept.of Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi-1.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, Doorsanchar Bhavan, ~~kmv~~ Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad-1.
3. The General Manager, Telecom, Guntur.
4. The Telecom Dist.Engineer, Ongole.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Telecom, Chirala-155.
6. One copy to Mr.P.Rathaiah, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
8. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd. (9) One spare copy.

pvm

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.GORTHI : MEMBER(AD)
AND

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

AND

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

Dated: 8 - 5 - 1994

~~ORDER~~ JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 411/94

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



2500