

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

DA 609/94.

Dt. of Order: 31-5-94.

A.Lakshmaiah

...Applicant

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,

2. Post Master General, A.P.,
Southern Region, Kurnool-5.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri Krishna Devan.

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.V.Raghava Reddy, Addl.CGSC

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

....2.

ASR P 94/

(ORDER PASSED BY HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI, MEMBER (A))

In this application the relief claimed by the applicant is for declaration that he is entitled to Productivity Link Bonus (P.L.Bonus) at the rate applicable to the regular Postal Assistants from 19-3-83 to 20-0-09 and to direct the respondents to pay the same to him.

2. The applicant was selected for appointment as Postal Assistant but was initially offered appointment as Reserve Trained Pool Postal Assistant (RTPPA). He worked in that assignment from 19-3-83 to 23-6-89 after having undergone the required job orientation training. On 24-6-89 he was given regular postal appointment. The applicant claims that he having worked for more than 240 days in each year during the period of 1983 to 1989 he is entitled to P.L. Bonus at the rate as is applicable to regular Postal Assistants.

3. Heard learned counsel for both the parties.

Mr.Krishna Devan, learned counsel for the applicant has drawn our attention to a judgement of the Ernakulam Bench of the Tribunal in a similar matter. In that case it was held that RTP Postal Assistants who put in 240 days of service in each year ending 31st March would be entitled to P.L.Bonus. It was further held that the amount of P.L.Bonus would be based on their average monthly

emoluments determined by dividing the total emoluments for each accounting year of eligibility by 12 and subject to other conditions of the scheme prescribed from time to time.

4. As the applicant herein is similarly situated as the ~~..... in the case (in 1993, decided by the Ernakulam~~ Bench of the Tribunal we see no reason why the applicant should not be given similar benefit.

5. Consequently we allow this D.A. at the admission stage itself with a direction to the respondents to grant to the applicant the same benefits as granted by the Ernakulam Bench of the Tribunal in the aforesated case. The respondents shall comply with this order within a period of 3 months from the date of communication of this order. No order as to costs.

Amirthi
(A.B.GORTHI)
Member (A)

Dt. 31st May, 1994.
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/

Prabhakaran
Deputy Registrar (J)CC

To

1. The Superintendent of Post Offices,
Anantapur Division, Anantapur.
2. The Postmaster General, A.P.
Southern Region, Kurnool-5.
3. One copy to Mr. Krishna Devan, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr. N.V.Raghava Reddy, Addl.CusC.CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm

*3rd May 6
25/94*

TMPED 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.CHANDRASEKAR REDDY
MEMBER(JUDL)

AND,

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

Dated: 31-5-1994.

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

in

O.A.No.

609/94

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed at admissions stage

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

pvm

29/6/94

