

21

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH
HYDERABAD.

OA/1996.

Date of order: 12-6-96.

Between:-

1. B. Gopala Krishna
2. D. Suresh Babu
3. S. A. Rahman
4. T. Venkat Swamy
5. B. Venkata Subbaiah
6. Md. Arif
7. M. Abdul Majeed
8. N. Satyanarayana
9. K. Thippanna
10. M. Venkatesha
11. M. Madhava Rao
12. V. Venkataiah .. Applicants.

And

1. The Telecom Commiss
Rep. by Chairman, Telecommunications, New Delhi.
2. The Director General Telecommunications, New Delhi.
3. The Chief General Mgr, Telecommunications,
A.P. Circle, Abids, Hyderabad.
4. The Dy. General Manager (Admn.),
Office of the CGMT, Telecommunications, A.P.
Circle, Abids, Hyderabad

Respondents.

Counsel for the Applicants: Mr. V. Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr. V. Bheemanna, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. G. CHAUDHARI, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI R. G. RAJAN, MEMBER ADMINISTRATIVE.

Hon'ble Tribunal made the following order:-

12 applicants filed this O.A., on the basis
of the instructions issued by the Office of the Chief
General Manager, Telecom, P. Circle, dt. 31-7-1995
(Annexure-III), contending that the 5th respondent may

initiate steps any time and disengage the applicants as casual labourers and if such a thing happens the applicants would suffer great hardship and irreparable loss. The instructions at Annexure A-III are Departmental instructions on the subject of irregular appointment of part-time employees/casual mazdoors. That contemplates action for dispensing with irregular employment. The order does not relate to any of the applicants. It is obvious that case of each applicant, if he is covered by the instructions will be scrutinised and action

taken. It cannot be presumed at this stage that such action is taken or will be taken in respect of any of the applicant. If, on scrutiny any of the applicant is found covered by the instructions that will be an independent question to be dealt on merits and on hypothetical ground that such action may be taken in future or would be wrong, no order is capable of being passed at this stage. The relief sought also is different than this apprehension by seeing Annexure-III to be quashed for a direction to grant temporary status and regularisation to the applicants. The matter of grant of temporary status and regularisation is not directly the subject matter of the impugned order. We therefore find that the application in the present form is misconceived and no cause of action has arisen to the applicants at this stage. And when any cause of action will arise, it will always be open to the applicants to adopt legal remedies.

The O.A. is accordingly summarily rejected.

The O.A. may be finally registered.

[Signature]
Dy. Registrar (Judl)

(23)

OA.702/96.

~~xxxTx~~

Copy to:-

1. The Telecom Commission, Rep.by Chairman,
Telecommunications, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Telecommunications, New Delhi.
3. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications,
A.P.-Circle, Abids, Hyderabad.
4. The Dy.General Manager (Admn.),
Office of the CGMT, Telecommunications, A.P.
Circle, Abids, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.V.Venkateswara Rao, Advocate,
CAT, Hyderabad Bench, Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.V.Bheemanna, CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
7. One copy spare.

kku.

26/6/96

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: 12-6-1996

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A./R.A./C.A.No.

in

O.A.No. 595/96

702/86

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.

