

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

D.A. 694/94.

Dt. of Decision : 22.6.94.

Smt. P. Nagamani

.. Applicant.

VS

1. Superintendent of Post Offices,
Anantapur District.

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

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant : Mr. Krishna Devan

Counsel for the Respondents : Mr. N.R. Devaraj, Sr.CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO : VICE CHAIRMAN

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

JUDGMENT

I as per Hon'ble Sri R.Rangarajan, Member(Administrative) X

Heard Sri Krishna Devan, learned Counsel for the applicant and Sri N.R.Devaraj, learned Standing Counsel for respondents.

2. In this application dt. 7.6.1994 filed under sec.19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant who was a Reserved Trained Pool Postal Assistant (R.T.P.P.A.) (S.D.C.) in Hindupur Division, prayed for a declaration that he is entitled for grant of Productivity Linked Bonus at the rates applicable to regular Postal Assistants between the period from 7.9.1984 to 20.9.1989 and for a further direction to pay the arrears of bonus to which the applicant is eligible within three months from the date of receipt of this order.

3. The applicant herein joined as R.T.P.P.A.(S.D.C.) on 7.9.1984 and served in that capacity till 20.9.1989. He states that he was selected after tough competition and performed the duties quantitatively and qualitatively the same work as that of regular Postal Assistants whenever he was engaged intermittently against the vacancies of regular Postal Assistants. By denying him the benefit of Productivity linked bonus during the period from 1984 to 1989 when he worked as R.T.P.P.A. allowed by the D.G., Department of Posts by letter dt. 5.10.1988, he has been subjected to hostile discrimination in violation of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution. Hence, this O.A. has been filed with the above prayer.

5. Similar order was also passed by this Tribunal in O.A.No.458/94 dt. 28.4.1994 where the applicants were similarly placed in the same situation as applicants in O.A.No.171/89 decided by the Ernakulam Bench and in O.A.No. 458/94 of this Bench, we see no reason in not extending the same benefit to the applicant in this O.A. also.

6. In the result this application is allowed with a direction to the respondents to grant to the applicant the same benefit as granted by the Ernakulam Bench and this Bench of the Tribunal in the aforesated cases. The above direction should be complied within a period of 3 months from the date of communication of this order.

7. The O.A. is ordered accordingly at the admission stage itself. No costs.

(R.Rangarajan)
Member (Admn.)

Gerb.

Dated 22nd June, 1994.

(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Deputy Registrar (J) CC

TEMED 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. CHANDRASEKARAN
MEMBER(JUDL)

AND

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

Dated: 22/6/1994.

~~COURT~~ JUDGMENT:

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

in

C.A. No. 694/94.

T.A. No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions *of admission*
Dismissed. *for filing*

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

pvm

