

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.Nagarjuna Rao	
6. K.Koteswara Rao	
7. B.Murali Krishna Murthy	
8. C.Karunya	
9. T.Raghavendra	21.I.Sai Babu
10. G.Kondaiah	22.V.Srinivas
11. T.Suseela	23.M.Najibur Rehman
12. G.Ramana Reddy	24.P.Ranga Sai
13. G.Laxmi Prasanna	25.Sarwar Baig
14. K.Uma Devi	26.P.Ramanarayana Rao
15. KP Jalaja Naidu	27.K.Leelavathi Kulkarni
16. E.Uma Devi	28.Y.Koteswara Rao
17. M.Jagath Kumar	29.L.K.Sandhya
18. P.Chandra Sekhar Rao	30.Ramachander Kulkarni
19. P.Yadagiri	31.N.Janakiram
20. C.Suseela Kumar	

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.Saide Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. V.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

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

If ultimately SLP No.8193/93 in C.C.Wo.20847/93 filed in the Apex Court against the judgment of batch case O.A.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 case, now submits that the S.L.P., in the above mentioned O.A.875/94 is not relevant in this case. But we are not sure, what decision is going to be given by the Apex Court in the Salo ~~case~~ S.L.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.L.P., is disposed of by the

The Review Application is dismissed. No costs.

प्रमाणित प्रति
CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

R. S. B.

स्थानकार्यालय

COURT OFFICER

फैसल प्रजासत्तिवाकाश
Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH

R.A.W.3/93
O.N.G.3/94

14/8/93

20/8/93

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, 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 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 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

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 will be 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..... 28/11/93
Court Officer
Central Administrative Tribunals
Hyderabad Bench

To

1. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Hyderabad City Divisional Hyderabad.
2. The Postmaster General, Andhra Circle, Hyderabad.
3. NEW Delhi-1.
4. One copy to Mr. N. Saida 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

pva

C. C.
S. S.

OA 675/93
17/11/93
29/11/93
S. S.