

(17)

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

C.A.NO. 545/95.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 5.7.95.

BETWEEN:

K.V.Ramana

Applicant

AND

1. The Director,  
Doordarshan Kendra,  
Ramanthapurk,  
Hyderabad-13.

2. The Director General,  
Doordarshan,  
Mandi House,  
New Delhi-110001.

Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANT: SHRI K.Rathnam.

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: SHRI NV Ramana  
Ex/Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI, MEMBER (ADMN.)

O.A.NO.545/95.

JUDGMENT

Dt:5.7.95

(AS PER HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO, VICE CHAIRMAN)

Heard Shri K.Ratnam, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri N.V.Ramana, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant was first engaged in December 1993 in Doordarshan as Casual Artist. He made representation to the respondents praying for regularisation of his services ~~xxxx~~ as per the scheme evaluated in 1992. It was rejected by the order dated 31.1.1995 by observing that the applicant is over-aged and hence his services cannot be regularised.

3. It is even conceded for the applicant that as per the scheme in existence, even after modification, the maximum age should be 30 years by 9.6.1992 and weightage has to be given for each year of service in which the Casual Artist worked for 120 days or more. The applicant was aged 40 years by 9.6.1992 and he was eligible for weightage for only one year i.e., for 19~~94~~ x in view of the modified scheme. As such, there is no infirmity in the impugned order dated 31.1.1995 when the case of the applicant was rejected on the ground that he was over-aged by the relevant date and hence his services cannot be regularised.

X

contd....

.. 3 ..

4. As such this OA which was filed praying for declaration that the order dated 31.1.1995 is illegal and for consequential direction to the respondents to regularise the services of the applicant in the post of General Assistant is dismissed even at the admission stage.

5. If there is any post for which there is no maximum age restriction and if the applicant is found suitable, this order of dismissal cannot be treated as bar for consideration of the case of the applicant for such post by the respondents. No costs. //

*.....*  
(A.B.GORTHI)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)

*X*  
(V.NEELADRI RAO)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

DATED: 5th July, 1995.  
Open court dictation.

*.....*  
Deputy Registrar (J) CC

vsn

To

1. The Director, Doordarshan Kendra, Ramantapur, Hyderabad-13.
2. The Director General, Doordarshan, Nandi House, New Delhi-1.
3. One copy to Mr. K.Ratnam, Advocate, 2-2-1118/1/6 New Nallakunta, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr.N.V.Ramana, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm

THPED 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

A N D A B Chorthi

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

DATED 517 1995.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

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

in  
OA.No. 545/95  
TA.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.

No Spare copy

