

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1417/96

DATE OF ORDER : 10-12-1996.

Between :-

A.Revi

.. Applicant

And

1. Director of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan,
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecommunications, AP,
Telecom Circle, Hyderabad-1.

.. Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the applicant : Shri K.R.Srinivas

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Vinod Kumar, CGSC

-- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI M.G.CHAUDHARI : VICE-CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI H.RAJENDRA PRASAD : MEMBER (A)

-- -- --

- 2 -

(Order per Hon'ble Shri H.Rajendra Prasad, Member (A)).

.. ..


Heard. Shri KR Srinivas, counsel for the applicant. Shri V.Vinod Kumar, standing counsel for the Respondents. The relief claimed by the applicant in this O.A. is to call for the written answer scripts of the applicant pertaining to English and Physics of the JTOs examination 1996 and to direct the respondents to re-value the papers and consequently to consider his appointment as Jr.Telecom Officer. As an interim measure the applicant prays that one reserved vacancy should be earmarked for him pending out come of this O.A.

2. The only ground urged in the application is that 5 other candidates belonging to the Scheduled Caste have been declared qualified upon the recommendations made by the High Power Committee. The applicant has secured 18, 47, 1 and 44 marks in papers I, II, III and IV respectively. He has thus failed to secure the qualifying marks in Papers I and III.

3. This Court does not feel to call for any answer scripts nor to direct the respondents to re-value them. Since these are not the tasks expected to be performed by us when there are no adequate grounds for directing the same. The only ground urged by him viz., that 5 other candidates declared qualified on the recommendations of High Power Committee. He has also misplaced in as much as definite instructions and guidelines insist for such high Power Committees to make recommendations under specific circumstances. The same has been ~~xxxx~~ done in the present case.

4. It is also noticed that the applicant has not made any representation to the concerned authorities and has approached this Court without exhausting any of the mutual remedies available to him.

5. There is absolutely no merit in the D.A. Hence rejected at the admission stage. No order as to costs.



(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
Member (A)


(M.G. CHAUDHARI)
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 10th December, 1996.

Dictated in Open Court.

av1/


Deputy Registrar (DCC)

O.A.1417/96

To

1. The Director of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi-1.
2. The Chief General Manager,
Telecommunications, A.P.
Telecom Circle, Hyderabad-1.
3. One copy to Mr. K.R. Srinivasa Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr. V.Vinod Kumar, Addl. CGSC. CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.
- 7) one copy to Hon'ble member (A), H Rajindran
pvm.

2/1/97

I COURT

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPILED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G. CHAUDHARI
VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD
MEMBER (ADMN)

Dated: 10-12-1996

~~ORDER~~ / JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 1417/96.

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.

