

33

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

Original Application No. 703 of 1996.  
OASR 1732 of 1996

Dt. of Order: 7-6-96.

Between :-

1. A.Jagannadha Rao
2. K.V.Anantha Patnaik
3. M.Sirajuddin
4. S.Narasimha Murthy

...Applicants

And

Union of India, represented by :

1. General Manager,  
SE Railway, Calcutta - 43.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,  
S.E.Railway, Visakhapatnam.
3. Sr.Divisional Mechanical Engineer (C&W),  
S.E.Railways, Visakhapatnam.
4. Sr.Divisional Personnel Officer,  
S.E.Railway, Visakhapatnam.
5. R.Neelagiri Rao
6. K.S.R.K.Prasad
- 7.S.V.Ramana
- 8.D.H.S.Prakasa Rao
- 9.P.Lakshmana Murthy
- 10.K.G.S.R.Patnaik
- 11.G.V.Ramana

...Respondents

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicants : Shri Y.Subrahmanyam

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri

(S) -- --

CORAM:

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

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

-- -- --

... 2.

(Orders per Hon'ble Justice Sri M.G.Chaudhari,  
Vice-Chairman).

-- -- --

We have heard the learned counsel for the applicants for admission of the O.A. Applicants seeks ~~for~~ quashing of the panel prepared on 1-5-96 of candidates selected for undergoing training of Intermediate apprentice TXRs at the System Printing School,, KGP. It is a provisional panel. The applicants contend that they were qualified to be included in the panel but they have not been included ~~and~~ <sup>by reason of</sup> the respondents not having prepared the panel on the basis of merit in the written examination, which is the sole criteria prescribed, but on the basis of ~~which~~ <sup>the</sup> seniority has been taken as sole criteria. They also contend that ~~injustice was done to them~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~Injustice was done to the applicants~~ way back in 1987 when the respondents extended the Training period of the applicants wrongly. The relief sought does not relate to the injustice allegedly done to the applicants by extending the training period which ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> a matter happened long back. Moreover that contention is also inconsistent with the contention that the panel has not been prepared on the basis of merit in the written examination which means that the question of seniority is not material. The applicants have not been able to disclose as to on what basis they contend that the panel has not been prepared on merits. They want records to be summoned and try to build up the case if it reveals something on which they can

*W.L.*

34

lay their hands. Such course is not permissible ~~as the~~ <sup>and as a</sup> matter of fact, we have to presume that the panel has been drawn in accordance with the rules and thus there is no grievance of the applicant <sup>said</sup> which may be sought to be required redressal at our hands.

2. The O.A. thus does not disclose any grievance and is summarily rejected.

H. Rajendra Prasad  
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)

Member (A)

M.G. Chaudhary  
(M.G. CHAUDHARI)

Vice-Chairman

Dated: 7th June, 1996.  
Dictated in Open Court.

M. M. Joshi  
Deputy Registrar (O) ce

av1/

0.A.703/96

To

1. The General Manager, SE Rly,  
Union of India, Calcutta-43.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
SE Rly, visakhapatnam.
3. The Sr.Divisional Mechanical Engineer(C&W)  
SE Rlys, visakhapatnam.
4. The Sr.Divisional Personnel Officer,  
SE Rly, visakhapatnam.
5. One copy to Mr.Y.Subramanyama, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr. ... SC for Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm.

1 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: 7-6-1996

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 505/96 703/96

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 अधिकार  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
प्रेषण/DESPATCH

7 JUL 1996

हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ  
HYDERABAD BENCH