

32

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:
AT HYDERABAD

OA 513/95

Date of decision: 24th July 1997

BETWEEN:

S.V.V.S.N. Murthy .. Applicant

AND

1. The Secretary to Govt. of India,
Ministry of Communications,
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Director General, Telecommunications,
20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110 001.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
4. The General Manager, Telecommunications,
Rajahmundry-533 150.
5. The Superintendent, Telegraphic
Trafic Division, Rajahmundry-533 104.
6. The Superintendent-in-Charge,
Central Telegraphic Office,
Rajahmundry - 533 101.

.. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. U.R.S. Gurupadam

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr. N.V. Raghav Reddy

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SRI H. RAJENDRA PRASAD: MEMBER (JUDL.)

ORDER

(Per Hon'ble Sri H. Rajendra Prasad: Member (Admn.))

Mr. U.R.S. Gurupadam for the applicant and Mr. W. Satyanarayana for Mr. N.V. Raghav Reddy on behalf of the respondents.

2. The applicant was engaged as a contingent worker until 10.4.1994 whereafter he duly agreed to discharge duties on part-time basis through the medium of a proper agency. He has been functioning on that basis from 1.10.85 and is receiving Rs.400/- per month for the work performed by him. Based on the facts and averments of the case and the disclosures

made in the counter-affidavit it is not found possible to grant the reliefs as prayed for by the applicant since he cannot be regarded as a full time casual mazdoor in the revealed context of the nature, medium and duration of his engagement and the wages received for the work performed by him. It is therefore only directed that, until the respondents evolve effective alternate modes of securing adequate man-power for the types of work which are now hired out to the agency, or initiate fresh recruitment of regular employees, as the case may be, the present arrangement shall continue.

3. It is further directed that, should the respondents decide to continue the agency system, the past experience and association of the applicant should be given due consideration and his case should be considered sympathetically for the purpose of entrustment of work to an agency, to the extent possible, in future as well.

4. Thus the OA is disposed of.


(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)

MEMBER (ADMN.)

Date: 24th July 1997

*Arsh
Safety Registration Office*

KSM

To

1. The Secretary to Govt. of India,
Ministry of Communications,
New Delhi-1.
2. The Director General, Telecommunications,
20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-1.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
A.P. Hyderabad.
4. The General Manager, Telecommunications,
Rajahmundry-150.
5. The Superintendent, Telegraphic Traffic Division,
Rajahmundry-104.
6. The Superintendent-in-Charge,
Central Telegraphic Office,
Rajahmundry-101.
7. One copy to Mr. U.R.S. Gurupadam, Advocate, CAT. Hyd.
8. One copy to Mr. N.V. Raghava Reddy, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
9. One spare copy.
11. One copy to HHRP.M. (A) CAT. Hyd.
12. One copy to D.R. (A) CAT. Hyd.

pvm.

~~28/8/97~~
T COURT

TYPED BY
CHECKED BY
COMPARED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE
VICE-CHAIRMAN
and

THE HON'BLE MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD:M(A)

Dated: 24-7-1997

~~ORDER/JUDGMENT~~

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

O.A.No.

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.

pvm

