

16

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

D.A.415/95.

Dt. of Order:29-3-95.

1. P. Abbaiah	11. B. Vijayakumari
2. -----	12. C. Ravinder Reddy
3. L.N. Devi Singh	13. Y. Bhushanam
4. S. Balaraj Goud	14. S. Prabhakar Reddy
5. M. Gangaram Goud	15. K. V. Krishna Rao
6. K. Krishna Mohan Rao	16. J. Vijaya Kumari
7. T. Susheel Kumar	17. Abdul Quayam
8. G. Shankar	
9. Gatadi Mohan	
10. K. Srinivas Rao	

... Applicants

Vs.

1. The Union of India rep. by the Secretary, Department of Posts, Dak Bhavan, New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Chief Postmaster General, A.P. Circle, Hyderabad-1.
3. The Postmaster General, Hyderabad Region, Hyderabad-1.
4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad Division, Nizamabad.
5. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Adilabad Division, Adilabad.
6. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Sangareddy Division, Sangareddy.

... Respondents

\* \* \*

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri T.V.V.S. Murthy

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N. V. Gopala Rao, Advocate

\* \* \*

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B. GORTHI : MEMBER (A)

\* \* \*

(Order passed by Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (A) )

\* \* \*

The applicants ~~who are~~ initially appointed as R.T.P. Postal Assistants and were later absorbed as regular Postal Assistants. The periods during which they worked as RTPPAs are furnished in Annexure A-I to the Original Application. The prayer of the applicants is for a direction to the Respondents to extend the benefit of the Judgement in O.A.611/94 and grant them Productivity Linked Bonus for the period during which they had worked as RTPPAs.

2. The applicants state that from the very date of their appointment as RTPPAs, they were performing duties similar to those performed by regular Postal Assistants for full eight hours a day or more. Accordingly they claim that they are also entitled for Productivity Linked Bonus.

3. Similarly situated employees approached this Tribunal (Ernakulam Bench and this Bench) claiming similar relief, which was granted. As the applicants before us are in the same situation as the applicants in O.A.611/94 and other Original Applications decided by this Tribunal, we see no reason in not extending similar benefit to the applicants also.

4. In the result, the Original Application is allowed with a direction to the Respondents to grant the applicants the same benefit as was granted by this Bench of the Tribunal in OA 611/94.

The above direction should be complied within a period of three months from the date of communication of this order.

5. The Original Application is ordered accordingly at the admission stage itself after hearing counsel for both the parties. No costs.

*ABG*  
(A.B.GORTHI)  
Member (A)

*V.N.Rao*  
(V.NEELADRI RAO)  
Vice-Chairman

*Avl/*  
Dt. 29th March, 1995.  
Dictated in Open Court.

*Avl/*  
Deputy Registrar (J) CC

To

1. The Secretary, Dept. of Posts,  
Union of India, Dak Bhavan, New Delhi-1.
2. The Chief Postmaster General, A.P.Circle,  
Hyderabad-1.
3. The Postmaster General, Hyderabad Region,  
Hyderabad-1.
4. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Nizamabad Division, Nizamabad.
5. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Adilabad Division, Adilabad.
6. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Sangareddy Division, Sangareddy.
7. One copy to Mr. T.V.V.S. Murthy Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
8. One copy to Mr. N.V. ~~Naghane~~ Addl. CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
9. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
10. One spare copy.

pvm

TYPED BY

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

AND

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

DATED - 29-3 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

O.A. No.

in  
415/95

T.A. No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed. along with OA.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

*No separate copy*

