

(61)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

O.A.NO. 421/95.

Date of Order: 3-4-95.

Between:

Mr. Ramakrishna [redacted]

.. Applicant.

and

1. Union of India rep. by the Secretary,
Ministry of Communications,
Dept. of Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhavan,
20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-1.
2. The Deputy Director General (Personnel)
Telecommunications Dept., Sanchar Bhavan,
New Delhi.
3. Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
Advanced Level Telecom Training Centre,
Ghaziabad, U.P.-2.
4. Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
A.P. Circle, Sanchar Bhavan,
Nampally Road, Hyderabad-1.

.. Respondents.

For the Applicant: Mr. S. Rama Krishna Rao, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. V. Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC.

CORAM:

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

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

The Tribunal made the following Order:-

Notice before admission. List it on 6-6-1995,
for reply in the meanwhile.

The applicant while working as J.T.O. was selected as Assistant Divisional Engineer (Telecom) (Class-I) and the order of appointment was given to him and he was sent for requisite training. But, by the impugned order dt. 7-3-1995 his period of probation was extended. The same is assailed in this O.A.

One has to pass the requisite examination for consideration for declaration of probation. It is stated that in view of the charge memo issued to the applicant for the alleged misconduct during the period he worked as JTO, the period of probation is extended. It is urged for the applicant that when the performance during the probation was held as satisfactory, it is not proper to the respondent to extend the period of probation on the ground that charge memo was already issued for the alleged misconduct during the period he worked as JTO. It is a matter for consideration in the OA.

The question as to what punishment that can be imposed if ultimately the applicant is found guilty and if so whether it has any bearing is also a matter for consideration.

In the circumstances, we feel that it is just and proper to permit the applicant to appear for the relevant examination which is necessary for declaration of the probation. Until further orders, his probation should not be declared.

fru/bm 4-4-85
Deputy Registrar(J)CC

To

1. The Secretary, Union of India,
Ministry of Communications, Dept. of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan, 20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-1.
2. The Deputy Director General (Personnel)
Telecommunications Dept. Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
Advanced Level Telecom Training Centre,
Ghaziabad, U.P.-2.
4. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
A.P. Circle, Sanchar Bhavan, Nampally Road, Hyderabad-1.
5. One copy to Mr. S. Ramakrishna Rao, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr. V. Bhimanna, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm

TYPED 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. R. RANGARAJAN: M(ADMN)

DATED - 3 - 4 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

O. A. No. 621/95
in

T. A. No. (W. P.)

Admitted and Interim directions
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

