

20

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No. 459/96

Date of Order : 17.7.96

BETWEEN:

U.Sambasiva Rao

.. Applicant.

AND

1. The Chief General Manager,  
Telecommunications, A.P.  
Circle Hyderabad.
2. The General Manager,  
Vijayawada Telecom Dist.,  
Vijayawada.
3. The Asst. General Manager (Adm.)  
O/o.General Manager Telecom,  
Vijayawada Telecom Dist.,  
Vijayawada.
4. The Divisional Engineer (Central),  
Phones, Dept. of Telecom,  
Governorpet, Vijayawada-520 002.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Phones,  
II, O/O.General Manager, Telecom,  
Telecommunications, Vijayawada. .. Respondents.

---  
Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.V.Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr.K.Ramulu  
---

CORAM:

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

J U D G E M E N T

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

---  
Mr.V.Rajeswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant  
and Mr.K.S.Ram Prasad for Mr.K.Ramulu, learned standing counsel  
for the respondents.

2. This OA is filed for quashing the impugned letter No. GMTD-VJ/TA/ACE-2/OBJ/SDOP-II/95-96/6 dt. 28.2.96 (A-3) whereby the respondents authorities disallowed the OTA payment of



(21)

Rs.698/-<sup>67</sup> holding it as illegal and arbitrary and for a consequential direction to pay him the OT allowance for the total number of hours worked by him during the period of a month at the specified rates.

3. When the OA was taken up for hearing today the learned standing counsel produced a letter No.VJ/LC/CAT/OA 459/96/16 dated 28.5.96 addressed to the Law Officer wherein it is stated ~~for~~ the recovered amount of Rs.690/- had already been paid to the casual driver. As a proof of that, a signed voucher is also enclosed to that letter. Both these annexures are taken on record.

*renewed*

4. In view of the fact that the <sup>has to</sup> amount had already been returned, it ~~as to~~ be held that the respondents authorities have reconsidered the issue and returned the money already recovered. In view of this no further order is necessary in this connection.

5. In Page-3, para-2 of the application it is stated that he has to be paid Rs.755/- as OT for the month of January. But the order challenged is only in regard to nonpayment of Rs.698/-. Hence the payment of Rs.755/- ~~need not~~ be considered in this OA. However, <sup>in connection to the</sup> the applicant may file a suitable representation in this concerned ~~to the~~ authorities.

6. Hence the OA is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

*me*

( R. RANGARAJAN )  
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 17th July, 1996

( Dictated in Open Court )

sd

*for Reg. 31(2) 1996*  
*Dr. Reg. 31(2) (S)*

contd-3/-

O.A.459/96.

Copy to:-

1. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.
2. The General Manager, Vijayawada Telecom Dist, Vijayawada.
3. The Asst. General Manager(Admn.), O/O General Manager Telecom, Vijayawada Telecom Dist, Vijayawada.
4. The Divisional Engineer(Central), Phones, Dept. of Telecom Governm~~et~~pet, Vijayawada.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Phones, II, O/O General Manager, Telecom, Telecommunications, Vijayawada.
6. One copy to Sri. V.Venkateswara Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
7. One copy to Sri. K.Ramlu, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
8. One copy to Library, CAT, Hyd.
9. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

17/8/96 459/96

TYPED BY  
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY  
APPROVED BY

THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

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

DATED:

17/7/96

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

O.A. NO. / R.A. / C.P. No.

O.A. NO.

459/96

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS ISSUED  
ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS  
DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS.

YLKR

II COURT

No spare copy

