

16

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

C.A. NO. 781/95

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 12-7-95

BETWEEN:

S. Perraju

: Applicant

and

1. Union of India, rep. by
Its Secretary
Urban Development Deptt.
Nirman Bhavan
New Delhi

2. Director Genl. of Public Works
CPWD, Nirman Bhavan
New Delhi

3. Chief Engineer
South Zone-II, CPWD
6th Floor, Posenett Bhavan
Tilak Roa, Hyderabad

4. Supdtg. Engineer (Civil)
CPWD, Visakhapatnam

5. S. Balaji, Asstt. Surveyor of Works

% Supdt. Surveyor of Works, R-3 Office : Respondents
COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: SHRI

P.B. Vijayakumar, Advocate
N.R. Devaraj

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI
Sr/Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{A.B. Gorthi} MEMBER (ADMN.)

17
OA.781/95

Judgement

(As per Hon. Mr. Justice V. Neeladri Rao, V.C.)

Heard Sri PB Vijayakumar, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.R. Devaraj, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA is filed praying for quashing office order No.124/95 dated 12-6-95 in so far as the applicant is concerned, by declaring it as illegal and for consequential direction for continuation of the applicant at Vijayawada.

3. The two main contentions for the applicant are :

- i) He is about to retire within two years and the guidelines lay down that one who is about to retire within two years should not be disturbed, and
- ii) That the office at Visakhapatnam, to which the applicant is transferred is being shifted to Madurai, and as the R-2 is considerate in ^{retaining} getting the employees in their respective states ^{if} possible, the applicant submitted representation dated 7-7-95 through Chief Engineer-~~Through~~ R-3, and hence the applicant may be allowed to continue in Vijayawada, the place at which he is working till the disposal of that representation.

4. Office order dated 12-6-95 shows that Sri M.V. Kidav, who is working at Calicut, has to relieve Sri S. Balaji, working at Hyderabad, and ^{on his} that relief, the latter had to relieve the applicant who is working at Vijayawada. It is stated that Sri Kidav had not yet

reported at Hyderabad. Thus, there is no immediate threat of relieving the applicant at Vijayawada. So we feel it not a case where an interim order has to be passed pending consideration of the representation of the applicant by R-2.

5. In the circumstances referred to, we feel that it is just and proper to require R-2 to dispose the representation dated 7-7-95 of the applicant as early as possible.

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

(A.B. Gorthi)
Member (Admn)

(V. Neeladri Rao)
Vice Chairman

Dated : July 12, 95
Dictated in Open Court

Arundhati
13-7-95
Deputy Registrar (J) CC

sk

To

1. The Secretary, Union of India,
Urban Development Dept., Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General of Public Works,
CPWD, Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. The Chief Engineer, South Zone-II,
CPWD, 6th Floor, Posenett Bhavan,
Tilak Road, Hyderabad.
4. The Superintending Engineer (Civil)
CPWD, Visakhapatnam.
5. S. Balaji, Asst. Surveyor of Works,
O/o Superintendent, Surveyor of Works,
6th Floor, Posenett Bhavan, Tilak Road, Hyderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. P.B. Vijayakumar, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
7. One copy to Mr. N.R. Devraj, Sr. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
8. One spare copy.
9. one copy to library, CAT. Hyd.

pvm.

13/7/95

THPED BY

13/7/98
CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD.

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

A.B. Goshy
THE HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN: (M (ADMN))

DATED ---12/7--- 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

OA.No.

in

781/95

TA.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions. at the

Dismissed:

admission stage

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No. order as to costs.

No spare copy

