

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

Original Application No. .....

Date of Order : 2nd August, 1996.

Between :-

1. K.Ramu	27.D.Sanyasi Rao
2. K.Ramakrishna Murthy	28.P.Surya Rao
3. R.Srinu	29.M.Srinivasa Rao
4. P.Simhachalam	30.Ch.Srinivasa Rao
5. Kalla Sankar Rao	31.V.Rama Rao
6. I.Parsuram	32.S.K.Khadar
7. R.Satyanarayana	33.Y.Seetharam
8. G.Goureeswar Rao	34.R.Srinivasa Rao
9. K.Akkayya	35.K.Appa Rao
10.M.Jagan Mohan Rao	36.S.Appala Raju
11.B.Anand Kumar	37.S.K.Khadar
12.K.Hari	38.S.Appalaswamy
13.S.Sreenu	39.K.Gangulu
14.D.Srinivasa Rao	40.B.Nageshwar Rao
15.Krishna Jena	41.A.V.Krishna Rao
16.N.Srinivasa Rao	42.Khadar Appala Paidi
17.N.Pedduraju	43.D.Srinivasa Rao
18.S.Laxman Rao	44.O.Santhosh Kumar
19.B.Rajesh	45.B.Srinivasa Rao
20.B.Ramesh	
21.S.K.Yashanu	
22.M.Sreenu	
23.S.K.Rahemtulla	
24.P.Ramakrishna	
25.Y.Prasad	
26.S.Umamashwar Rao	.... Applicants

And

1.Divisional Railway Manager (P),  
S.E.Railway, Waltair, Visakhapatnam  
District-530 001.

.... Respondent

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri B.Ragunatha Rao

Counsel for the Respondent : Shri C.V.Malla Reddy, SC for Rlys

-- -- --

*hcr*

... 2.

CORAM:

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

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

(Oral Orders per Hon'ble Shri M.G.Chaudhari,  
Vice-Chairman).

-- -- --

A large number of applicants for recruitment as  
Casual Labourers for a period of 119 days ~~invited on~~<sup>in pursuance of notice dated</sup> 30-5-90  
allege that the ~~list~~ of 80 selected candidates as prepared  
is illegal as they believe that most of the candidates selected  
were dis-qualified at the physical test and although the appli-  
cants had qualified ~~thereat~~, they have been denied the selection.  
This is a mere vague grievance made. There is nothing stated  
as to which particular candidates among the selected candidates  
were dis-qualified at the Medical Test or the basis for such  
allegations <sup>on which</sup> being made. Alligations are also made in general  
terms that candidates ~~candidates~~ & were not selected from Araku  
Sub-Division and sons of Railway employees have not been given  
preference. ~~This grievance can be, as it is carried out by~~  
~~arises from~~  
the non-selection but that does not reveal any grievance which  
can be legally entertained. The proper course for the  
applicants was to file proper representation to the authority  
concerned viz., Divisional Railway Manager (P), S.E.Railway,  
Waltair, Visakhapatnam, pointing out the alleged irregularities  
in the selection. However, instead of representing their cases,  
the applicants merely sent telegrams to the Railway General  
Manager, Visakhapatnam, and rushed to the Tribunal to file

(b)

O.A. The statement in para-7 of the O.A. that they have and availed of all the remedies is not quite accurate.

2. Shri C.V.Malla Reddy, standing counsel for the Respondents who appears on notice submits that it is open to the applicants to file a representation to the concerned authority. We ~~again~~ agree with that submission. Hence with leave to applicants, to file a representation to the appropriate authority, if so advised and with the ~~explanation~~ <sup>expectation</sup> that the concerned authority will look into the grievances of the applicants and dispose of the representation and communicate the decision thereon to the applicants as expeditiously as possible, after the representation is received, <sup>the OA is disposed of</sup>
3. The O.A. is disposed-of. No order as to costs.

  
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)  
Member (A)

  
(M.G.CHAUDHARI)  
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 2nd August, 1996.  
Dictated in the Open Court.

av1/

Asst. <sup>1856</sup>  
Deputy Registrar (O.C.)

08/03/66

-4-

12

To

1. The Divisional Railway Manager (P)  
S.C.Rly, Waltair, Visakhapatnam Dist- 1.
2. One copy to Mr. B.Raghunatha Rao, Advocate, CAT.Hyderabad.
3. One copy to Mr. C.V.Malla Reddy, SC for Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm.

5-Copies  
1978/92

I COURT

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

COMPARED 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:M(A)

Dated: 2 - 8 - 1996

~~ORDER~~/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 595/96 934/96.

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

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकारण Central Administrative Tribunal DEPT/DESPATCH
16 AUG 1996
हैदराबाद बायपोठ HYDERABAD BENCH