

(46)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:  
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A. NO. 585/95

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 3.5.95

BETWEEN:

1. Kalla Gurunadha Rao
2. Yagati Subba Rao
3. Imandi Venkata Gowri Varaprasad
4. V.Nagashatya Rao

APPLICANTS

AND

1. The Chief General Manager,  
Hyderabad-1.
2. The Director (Telegraph Traffic),  
Telecom, Abids,  
Hyderabad-1.
3. The Sr. Superintendent,  
Telegraph Traffic,  
Visakhapatnam Division,  
Visakhapatnam-1.
4. The Asstt. Superintendent,  
Telegraph Traffic-in-Charge,  
District Telegraph Office,  
Vijayanagaram.
5. The Superintendent-in-Charge,  
Central Telegraph Office,  
Sreekakulam.

RESPONDENTS

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI N.V.RAGHAVA REDDY  
Sr./Addl.CGSC

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMN.)

CONTD....

(15)

O.A.NO.585/95.

JUDGMENT

Dt: 3.5.95

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

Heard Shri M.P.Chandramouli, learned counsel for the applicants and Shri N.V.Raghava Reddy, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. There are ~~four~~ applicants in this OA who are temporary part-time Telegraphmen. They were engaged from 13.10.1992, 24.3.1994, 3.4.1994 and 7.10.1993 respectively. This OA is filed for direction to the respondents to continue to engage the applicants in the respective job as otherwise the applicants will be put to serious irreparable loss and hardship.

3. The said work was entrusted to agencies on contract basis by dis-engaging the applicants.

4. The prayer in this OA is the same as the prayer in OA 412/95 decided on 30.3.1995. Hence, we see no reason to differ from the directions already given in OA 412/95.

5. In the result, the following direction is given:

The applicants will make representation to R-2 for their engagement as Telegraphmen on hourly basis

contd....

(16)

.. 3 ..

If such a representation is going to be made by sending it by RPAD by 15.5.1995, the same has to be disposed of till the said representation is disposed of. the applicants have to be engaged on hourly basis as Telegraphmen at the rates which they were being paid till today, on production of a copy of this order at the earlier possible date. ~~if such representation is disposed of~~ It is needless to say that if the applicants are going to be aggrieved by the order to be passed by R-2, they are free to move this Tribunal under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

6. The OA is ordered accordingly at the admission stage. No costs.

(R.RANGARAJAN)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)

  
(V. NEELADRI RAO)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 3rd May, 1995.  
Open court dictation.

  
Deputy Registrar (J) CC

vsn

To  
1. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad-1.  
2. The Director(Telegraph Traffic) Telecom, Abids, Hyderabad-1.  
3. The Sr. Superintendent, Telegraph Traffic, Visakhapatnam Division, Visakhapatnam-1.  
4. The Asst.Superintendent, Telegraph Traffic-in-Charge, Dist.Telegraph Office, Vijayanagaram.  
5. The Superintendent-in-Charge, Central Telegraph Office, Sreekakulam.  
6. One copy to Mr.M.P.Chandramouli, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.  
7. One copy to Mr.N.V.Raikava Reddy, Addl.CGSC,CAT.Hyd.  
8. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.  
9. One spare copy.

pvm

*Received  
ar 5/1/95  
3.00 p.m.*  
TYPED BY *JK* CHECKED BY  
COMPARED BY *JK* 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.R.RANGARAJAN: M(AD MN)

DATED - 3 - 5 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M. A. /R. A. /C. A. NO.

O. A. No.

in  
S 85/95

T. A. No.

(W. P. )

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

*along with OA copy*

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

*Not for photocopy*

