

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
HYDERABAD

OA No. 597/94

Judgement dated 27-5-94

Between

1. V. Udaya Bhaskar
2. Y. Anjaneyulu
3. G. Sambasiva Rao
4. S. Gnaneswara Rao
5. S. Ramakrishna
6. K. Muniyya

Applicants

1. Chief General Manager,
Telecom, A.P., Hyderabad.
2. General Manager,
Telecom. GUNTUR

Respondents

Learned counsel for the applicants: Shri M. Lakshmana
Murthy

Learned counsel for the Respondents: Shri K. Bhaskar Rao

Coram

Hon'ble Justice Shri V. Neeladri Rao, Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Shri R. Rangarajan, Member (Admn.)

Initialed

OA. 597/94

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, Vice Chairman)

Heard Sri P. Bhaskar, for Sri M. Lakshmana Murthy, learned counsel for the applicants and Sri K. Bhaskar Rao, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. These six applicants ^{who are} ~~were~~ working as T.S.Os, filed this OA challenging their transfer from Tenali to the

same places referred to in the impugned proceedings dated 11-5-1994. The main contention for the applicants is that they were transferred while continuing their juniors at Tenali and it is contrary to the normal policy that is ~~put forward~~ ^{forwarded}.

3. It is not in controversy that in view of the surplus at Tenali it became necessary to transfer some TSOs from Tenali. It is also not disputed that as per the Station Seniority, the applicants are junior to those who are allowed to continue at Tenali. Even though the applicants may be seniors to those who are continued at Tenali in the category of TSOs, the question as to whether Cadre Seniority has to be followed or Station seniority has to be followed when it is necessary to transfer in case of surplus is a matter for consideration on the basis of circulars/ letters etc. if any. The applicants have not drawn our attention to any such letter or circular etc.

4. It is next submitted for the applicants that there is surplus in the category of TSOs even in Guntur, to which they are transferred. Sri K. Bhaskar Rao, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that he has no instructions.

2nd PG

5. In the circumstances, it is just and proper to dispose of the OA at the admission stage by the following order :

The applicants are free to submit their representations to R-1 i.e. the Chief General Manager, Telecom, AP Hyderabad, against the order of their transfer and if it is so submitted by 13-6-1994, R-1 has to dispose the same dispassionately and expeditiously and preferably by 27-6-1994. It is also open to the applicants to make a representation to R-2 to retain them at Tenali till their representation to R-1 if ~~it~~ ^{they} is going to be submitted, ~~is~~ ^{is} disposed by R-1 and R-2 will naturally consider as to whether there is surplus even at Guntur and if so whether it is not just and proper to retain them at Tenali till the disposal of the representation by R-1 as referred to. No costs.

(R. Rangarajan)
Member (Admn.)

(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated : May 27, 94

Dictated in the Open Court Deputy Registrar(J)CC

To

1. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, A.P. Hyderabad.
2. The General Manager, Telecom, Guntur.
3. One ^{sk} copy to Mr. M. Lakshmana Murthy, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr. K. Bhaskar Rao, Addl. CGSC, CAT. Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT. Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm

200 & 201
R-1 & R-2
1.6.94

TEMPED 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

THE HON'BLE MR. A. B. G. RTHI : MEMBER(A)

AND

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

AND

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

Dated 27-5-1994.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in

O.A.No.

T.A.No.

597/94

(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

