

(18)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.
290/96.

Date of order: 11.3.96.

Between:-

P.Shankar Reddy ... Applicant.

And

1. The Telecom District Manager, Nalgonda.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications, Doorsanchar Bhavan, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad.
3. Union of India, rep. by the Director General, Department of Telecommunication, New Delhi.

... Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents: ~~Mr.~~ N.V. Raghava Rao
Addl CGS

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.G.CHOUDHARY, VICE CHAIRMAN

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

DA 290/96.

Dt. of Order: 11.3.96.

(Order passed by Hon'ble Justice Shri M.G.Choudhary,
Vice-Chairman).

-- -- --

The claim of the applicant and the grievance made by him is similar to the case of the two applicants in DA^{Sr.} 627/96 in which we have just now passed an order giving certain directions to the respondents. For the same reasons as are indicated in that order we make similar directions to the Respondents in this O.A. The Original Application is ordered accordingly and disposed of with the following direction :-

" It will be in the interest of justice to direct the respondents to dispose of the representation of the applicant dt.26-12-94 in the light of the earlier decision of the Tribunal in DA 739/93 dt.22.9.94 and the contentions raised by the applicant in this O.A. The Respondents shall take a decision in the matter within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order and shall communicate to the applicant. In the event of being aggrieved by the decision, the applicant will be at liberty to adopt such remedies as ~~they are~~ ^{may be} advised in accordance with law. The applicant may supply an additional copy of the compilation of the Original Application and if it is so supplied, it may be sent to the respondents along with the copy of this order to enable the Respondents to consider the contentions of the applicants for the purpose of taking a decision as directed above."

W.M.

....3.

(20)

2. Subject to the above directions, the Original Application is disposed of at the admission stage itself. There will be no order as to costs.

H.RAJENDRA PRASAD
(H.RAJENDRA PRASAD)
Member (A)

M.G.CHAUHARY
(M.G.CHAUHARY)
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 11th March, 1996.
Dictated in Open Court.

Dy. Legal Officer (C)

av1/

21

Copy to:-

1. The Telecom District Manager,
Nalgonda.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
Doorsanchar Bhavan, Nampally Station Road, Hyd.
3. The Director General, Department of
Telecommunications, Union of India,
New Delhi.
4. One copy to Mr. K. Venkateswara Rao, Advocate,
CAT, Hyd.
Mr. N. V. Raghava Dasay, Addl.
5. One copy to CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

kku.

18/4/96
I COURT

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

W.B. Chaudhary
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

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

Dated: 11-3-1996

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A/R.A./C.A.NO.

O.A.No. 290/96

T.A.No.

(w.p.No.)

Admitted and Interim directions issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions *of the admission*
Dismissed. *stages*

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

*No. 80
C.R.*

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकार्य Central Administrative Tribunal प्रियवर्ण/DESPATCH 15 APR 1996 हृदयवाद न्यायपीठ HYDERABAD BENCH

(10)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

C.P.No.13/97 in OA.290/96

Date of Order: 1.5.97

BETWEEN:

P.Shanker Reddy

.. Applicant.

AND

1. Sri K.Sampath Kumar, I.T.S.,
The Telecom Dist Manager,
Nalgonda.

2. Sri M.V.Bhaskar Rao, The Chief
General Manager, Telecom, AP under,
HYderabad.

.. Respondents.

3. Sri A.V.Gokak, The Chairman,
Telecom Commission, New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.K.Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.N.R.Devraj

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

HON'BLE SHRI B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (JUDL.)

O R D E R

X Oral order as per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (Admn.) X

Heard Mr.K.Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. N.R.Devraj, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents now submits that though it was initially thought of rejecting his representation, it was reconsidered and it was decided to

R

D

.. 2 ..

give him the same relief as was given to the applicant in OA.739/93 dt. 22.9.94. It is further stated that the ^{World} in this connection granting him the relief ^{will be} ~~will~~ is within a weeks time. In view of the above, the resp ^{may be done} counsel submits that the CP ~~does not lie~~ is.

3. Noting the above submission of the learned for the respondents the C.P. is closed.

BS
B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (Judl.)

1.5.97

Dated: 1st May, 1997

(Dictated in Open C

sd

: 3 :

Copy to:-

1. Sri. K.Sampath kumar, I.T.S. Telecom Dist Manag Nalgonda.
2. Sri. M.V.Bhaskar Rao, Chief General Manager, Hyd.
3. Sri. A.V.Gokak, Chairman, Telecom Commission
4. One copy to Sri. K.Venkateswar Rao, advocate
5. One copy to Sri. N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CCGSC.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

6
126/97

TYPED BY
COMPIRED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDER BAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.R.G.RAJAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR:
M(J)

DATED: 1/5/97

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

R.A/C.P/M.A. No. 13/97

in

D.A. No.

290/96

ADMITTED INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED

ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLR

II COURT

