

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD. RA 83/96 in ũ.A.No. 1065/96 T.A.N.

DATE OF DECISION: 30-10-96 L.Gidda Reddy & 59 others PETITIONER(S) Shri K. Venkateshwar Rao, _ADVGCATE FOR THE PETI†ICNER(S) VERSUS. The Telecom District Manager, _ RUSE NOENT (s) Mahabubnagar & 3 others Shri kRamulu, HOVECATE FOR THE RESPUNDENT (S) THE HUN'ELE JUSTICE SHRI M.G.CHAUDHARI : VICE- CHAIRMAN

SHRI H.RAJENDRA PRASAD THE HUN'SLE MEMBER

- whather Reporters oflocal papers may be allowed to see the judgement?
- To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
- Whather their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of З. the judgement ?
- 4. Whether the Judgement is to be circulated to the other Sanches ?

Judgement delivered by Hon'ble JUSTICE Shri M.G.Chaudhari, Vice-Chairman

> (HHRP) M(A)

(HMGCJ)





IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

RA 83/96 in DA 1065/96

DATE OF ORDER: 30-10-96

Between :-

1. L.Gidda Reddy 31.M.Rajashekar 2. M.Krishnaiah 32.V.Eswar Reddy 3. D.Srinivasulu 33.U.Nageswara Rao 4. T.Venkatanna 34.Syed Saleem 5. M.Prakash 35.B.Kirhnaiah 6. C. Venkataiah 36.Syed Khadravali 7. S.Subhan 37.V.Kurmanna 8. Krishnaiah 38.Sk.Md.Nazeer Ahmed 9. G.Krishnaiah Goud 39.R.Ch.Khasim Vali 10.S.Usman Basha 40.C.Nagaiah 11.G.Gopala Krishna 41.G.Shankar Reddy 42.Md.Abid Rim 12.Veerabhadraiah 13.M.Sudhakar 43.5.P.Abdul Shukur 14.Md.Raheemuddin 44.M.Ramulu 15.M.Lasmaiah 45.P.Ramachander 16.Kista Reddy 46.Ameer 17.Sk.Dhasthagir 47.V.Ramulu 18.N.Raju 48.M.Krishnachary 19.P.Bhaghavanthu 49.A. Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy 20.D.Roshan Basha 50.G.Shankar 21.R. Venkatanna 51.Anjaneyulu 22.Balkishan 52.M.Mahabub Subani 23.S.Md.Ismail 53.G.Bal Raju 54.S.Pandu Řanga Reddy 24.8.Kondanna 25.M.Somanath 55.M.Shantamallu 56.Syed Basheeruddin 57.Syed Vijayath Ali 26.K.Nagabhushan Rao 27.G. Anantha Reddy . 28.P.Laxminarayana 58.S.Shivaiah 29.Md.Mugthar 59.T.Harinath 30.D.Jangaiah 60.P.Chandra Reddy

... Applicants

And

- 1. The Telecom District Manager, Mahabubnagar.
- 2. The Chief General Manager, Telecom, AP Circle, Hyd.
- 3. The Chairman, Telecom Commission, New Delhi.
- 4. The Director General, Telecommunication, New Deihi.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri K. Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri K.Ramulu, CGSC

CORAM:

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

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

WM - ...2.



(Order per Hon'ble Justice Shri M.G.Chaudhari, Vice-Chairman).

Shri K.Venkateswara Rao for the applicants. Shri K.Ramulu standing counsel for the respondence. Admit. Notice waived. By consent taken up for final orders. The applicants had challenged the letter No.7-27/94/NCG dt.11.7.96 issued by the Department of Telecommunications and consequential relief in the OA which was filed on 21-8-96. By order dt.19-9-96 the DA was disposed of interms of the order passed therein (following the earlier order in OA Nos. 992/96 with DA 1007/96. It now however transpires that prior to the date of order the impugned letter dt.11.7.96 was withdrawn by the government. In that since the cause of action did not survive on the date on which the order in the CA was passed but the letter of withdrawal of the said letter was not brought to the notice of the Court. It may be mentioned that the letterbearing No.7-27/94/NCG of) the Department of Telecommunications dt.9-9-96is now annexed to the review application. The review applicants submit that in the circumstances they may be allowed to withdraw the original OA. think that the request is just and proper. Hence following order:-

The review application is allowed. The order dt.19-9-96 disposing the OA is hereby set aside and the OA is restored. No order as to costs.

(H.RAJENORA PRASAD)
Member (A)

(M.G.CHAUDHARI) Vice-Chairman

Dated: 30th October, 1996.
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/

Andri 3.122