

8

11

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNA: HYDERABAD BENCH.

AT HYDERABAD.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.391 of 1996

Dated of order: 20.1.97

Between

1.T.Muralidhar Rao.

2. B.Prakash.

3. G.Viswanadham.

4. D.Nagi Reddy

5. T.Gopala Krishna.

6. M.V.Subba Rao.

..Applicants.

and

1.Chairman, Telecom Commission,
M/o.Communications,
Dept., Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi.

2. Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
AP.Hyd.

.. Respondents.

Counsel for the applicants: Shri.K.Lakshminarasimha.

Counsel for the Respondents: Shri N.V.Raghava Reddy Addl.CGSC.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN: MEMBER (A)

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

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

Heard Shri K.Lakshmi Narasimha for the applicants
and Shri R.V.Raghava Reddy for the respondents.

2. There are 6 applicants in this O.A. they were initially
appointed as Jr.Engineers. Their next promotion is to the

Hz

cadre of Asst. Engineer. For promotion to the Asst. Engineer, they should qualify themselves in a Departmental Examination called "TES Group B examination". As per para 206 of the P & T Manual, the date of passing the said qualifying examination decides the seniority in the higher grade of Asst. Engineer. The applicants submit that some of the Jr. Engineers who had passed the qualifying examination later were promoted to the cadre of Asst. Engineer earlier to them and they were shown senior though the applicants are entitled to be treated as seniors, in view of the fact that they had passed the departmental qualifying examination earlier.

3. In O.A.178/92. O.A.195/92 etc., this Tribunal had held that those who qualified in the departmental examination earlier are to be treated seniors to those who qualified in the departmental examination later in accordance with para 206 of the P & T Manual. When that was not implemented, CP.N in OA.178/92 and batch was filed on the file of this Bench which was disposed of on 5.1.1996. It was held in that order of CP that "Petitioners in the CP have to be given notional promotion from the date which the respective junior as per the seniority list actually assumed charge as A.E. and as on that date, the pay of each of them in the CP in the post of A.E. has to be fixed and thereafter the pay of each of them on the date on which actually assumed as A.E. has to be fixed and thereafter the pay of each of them on the date on which actually assumed as AE has to be re-fixed and the arrears have to be paid basing on the same". Against that order a

[Handwritten signature]

10
:: 3 ::

13
Civil Appeal No.1814/93 and batch was filed in the Apex court which was disposed of on 23.10.96 dismissing the SLPs.


4. When the Review petition on the SLP is only under contemplation, the department has no other alternate except to grant the same benefit to the applicants in this O.A. as was granted in CP 18/93 to CP 21/93.

5. In view of the submission we allow this application and direct the respondents to implement the orders in this case also as given in CP 18/93 to CP 21/93 on the file of this Bench.

6. The Original Application is ordered accordingly.
No costs. Time for compliance is 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Sd/-
Court Officer.
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Hyderabad Bench.

//true copy //



Contempt Petition

Before the Central Administrative
Tribunal, Hyderabad, Hyderabad
Bench.

C.P.No.

of 1997

in

O.A.No. 391/96



Contempt Petition

Regd
17/7/97
N.V.R. Rao
Am

M/s.K.Lakshmi Narasimha, LL.M.
P.Lakshmana Rao,
Counsel for Applicants.

May 26/97