

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

\*\*\*\*

O.A.675/94.

Dt.of Decision : 17-11-9

1. V.Ravi Krishna
2. P.Nagalaxmi
3. P.Nirmala
4. Elizabeth Christian
5. A.Nagarajuna Rao
6. K.Koteswara Rao
7. B.Murali Krishna Murthy
8. C.Karunya
9. T.Raghavendra
10. G.Kondaiah
11. T.Sushela
12. G.Ramana Reddy
13. G.Laxmi Prasanna
14. K.Uma Devi
15. KP Jalaja Naidu
16. E.Uma Devi
17. M.Jagath Kumar
18. P.Chandra Sekhar Rao
19. P.Yadagiri
20. C. Suresh Kumar

21. I.Sai Babu
22. V.Srinivas
23. M.Najibur Rehman
24. P.Ranga Sai
25. Sarwar Baig
26. P.Ramanarasing Rao
27. K.Leejavathi Kulkarni
28. Y.Koteswara Rao
29. L.K.Sandhya
30. Ramachander Kulkarni
31. N.Janakiram

Applicants

Vs

1. The Sr.Suptd., of Post Offices,  
Hyderabad Citi Division at Hyderabad.
2. The Postmaster General,  
Andhra Circle, Hyderabad-1.
3. The Director General (Postal),  
New Delhi-1.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants

: Mr. N.Saida Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

: Mr. V.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

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

-124-

: 2 :

If ultimately SLP No.8193/93 in C.C.No.20847/93 filed in the Apex Court against the judgment of batch case O.A.No.814/90 and batch are going to be dismissed, the applicants herein also have to be given the same benefits of temporary status and consequential benefits thereon that were granted to applicants in O.A.814/90 and batch case before Ernakulam Bench reported in 1993(23)ATC 822. O.A., stands dismissed. If any modified order is going to be passed by the Apex Court, the applicants herein are also entitled to the benefits granted by the modified judgment of the Apex Court."

The applicant in this R.A., now submits that the S.D.P., in the above mentioned O.A.675/94 is not relevant in this case. But we are not sure, what decision is going to be given by the Apex Court in the said S.D.P. Hence, it is not correct to admit the review petition as

In view of the above, the R.A., is dismissed but opportunity is given to the applicant to file a Review Application, if so advised, after the S.D.P., is disposed of by the Apex Court.

The Review Application is dismissed/ No costs.

प्रमाणित प्रति  
CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

न्यायालय अधिकारी  
COURT OFFICER

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकारी  
Central Administrative Officer  
HYDERABAD BENCH

रा. अ. 43/92  
O.A. 675/94  
14/8/92  
20/8/92

15  
- 3 - 11 -

4. The learned counsel for the respondents has brought to our notice that this O.A. is squarely covered by the order in judgement in O.A.962/93<sup>on the file of this bench</sup>, decided on 18-8-1995 wherein both of us were parties to that judgement. In that O.A. also the applicants therein prayed for counting of their service etc. of Short Duty Assistants for the purpose of qualifying service in the matter of seniority, annual increments, pension etc. on the basis of the judgement of Ernakulam Bench in a similar batch case, O.A.814/90 and batch reported in 1993 (23) ATC 822. But the judgement of Ernakulam Bench in the batch cases referred to above has been stayed by the Apex Court. In view of the above, the O.A. 962/93 was disposed of with a condition that the applicants be given the same benefit of the judgement of the Ernakulam Bench referred to above, provided the Apex Court dismisses the S.L.P. No. 8193/93 in C.C.No.20847/93. In view of the above, of the batch cases on the file of Ernakulam Bench. We feel that a similar direction can be given in this O.A. also.

5. In view of the above, the following direction is given:-

If ultimately SLP No.8193/93 in C.C.No.20847/93 filed in the Apex Court against the judgement of batch case O.A.No.814/90 and batch are going to be dismissed, the applicants herein also has to be given the same benefit

- 19 -

of temporary status and consequential benefits thereon that were granted to applicants in OA 814/90 and batch case before Ernakulam Bench reported in 1993 (23) ATC 822. But, if the said S.L.P. are going to be allowed, this O.A. stands dismissed. If any modified order is going to be passed by the Apex Court, the applicants herein are entitled to the benefits granted by the modified judgement of the Apex Court.

6. The O.A. is ordered accordingly. No costs. //

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

.....  
Date.....  
Court Officer  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Hyderabad Bench

To

1. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Hyderabad City Division at Hyderabad.
2. The Postmaster General, Andhra Circle, Hyderabad.
3. New Delhi-1.
4. One copy to Mr.N.Saibaba Rao, Advocate, CAT,Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.V.Bhimanna Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to .....

pvm

T.C.

CA 1675/95
17.11.95
29.11.95