

(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.)

JUDGEMENT

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

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

(D)

(21)

61
Rs.698/- 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 takenup for hearing today the learned standing counsel produced a letter No.VJ/IC/CAT/OA 459/96/16 dated 28.5.96 addressed to the Law Officer wherein it is stated that 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.

Received

4. In view of the fact that the amount had already been returned, it ~~as to~~ has been 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, the applicant may file a suitable representation in this concerned to the authorities.

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

one / 2

(R.RANGARAJAN)
Member (Admn.)

Dated: 17th July, 1996

(Dictated in Open Court)

Amrit
D.P. Registrar (T)

sd

cmr 17-31

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 Government, 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/-

① 178196 459/ab

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

D.A. No./R.A/C.P. No.

D.A. NO.

459/ab

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

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकारण
Central Administrative Tribunal

प्रेषण/DESPATCH

30 JUL 1996 *Naik*

हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ
HYDERABAD BENCH