

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.808/96.

Date of order : 7.8.1996.

Between

K.Gangadhar Rao

.. Applicant

And

1. Chief General Manager,  
Telecom., A.P.Circle,  
Hyderabad.

2. Telecom. District Manager,  
Sangareddy.

.. Respondents

---

Counsel for the Applicant .. Shri D.Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents .. Shri V.Bhimanna,  
Addl. CGSC

---

C O R A M

Hon'ble Shri Justice M.G.Chaudhari : Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Shri H.Rajendra Prasad : Member(A)

Order

(Per Hon'ble Shri Justice M.G.Chaudhari : Vice-Chairman)

By order dated 1.1.96 issued by the Telecom. District Manager, Sangareddy, the applicant who was Draughtsman Grade-II was placed as Draughtsman Grade-I in the scale of Rs.1600-2660 on completion of 4 years of service w.e.f. 10.10.95. That order has been cancelled by the same authority on 30.1.96. ~~which is~~ ~~That order is assailed in this O.A.~~

reasons have been indicated in that order as to why the placement of the applicant in Grade-I was cancelled.

the applicant has annexed instructions issued by the Office of Chief General Manager, Telecommunication bearing No.TA/STA/29-1/Rlgs/II dated 2.2.96.

From those instructions that the orders passed of Grade-II Draughtsman as Grade-I were issued by local officers whereas these are required

(21)

to be issued by the Circle Office and therefore the placements were treated as irregular. Presumably that was the reason for which the placement of the applicant was also cancelled. The said instructions further state as follows:-

"The Circle Office is already considering the promotions of eligible Grade-II Draughtsmen to Grade-I Draughtsman."

It, however, ~~thus~~ appears that during the period from 2.2.96 till today the applicant has not been informed about his placement to Grade-I or otherwise. When it was stated in the instructions dated 2.2.96 that the Circle Office was already considering the promotions we have to assume that by this time the exercise should have been completed and the applicant who was subjected to cancellation of his placement ~~should have been~~ ~~was~~ informed of his position. Under the circumstances the following order is passed:-

K

The Chief General Manager, Telecommunications, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad is directed to convey to the applicant the decision as regards his placement as Draughtsman Grade-I in the light of the ~~regular~~ letter referred to hereinabove dated 2.2.96 within a period of one month from ~~communication~~ ~~today~~. ~~His order to him.~~ In the event of the applicant being denied the placement it will be open to him to adopt such remedies as are open to him in accordance with the law.

✓

2. Shri V.Bhimanna, learned Standing Counsel for the Central Government appears for the respondents and takes note of the above direction.

✓

3. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

H.Rajendra Prasad  
( H.Rajendra Prasad )  
Member (A).

M.G.Chaudhari  
( M.G.Chaudhari )  
Vice-Chairman.

Dated: 7.8.1996.

Dictated in Open Court.

br.

Deputy Registrar (O.C.C.)

O.A.808/96.

To

1. The Chief General Manager,  
Telecom, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.
2. The Telecom District Manager,  
Sangareddy.
3. One copy to Mr.D.Venkateswar Rao Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
4. One copy to Mr.v.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

pvm.

*Arv*  
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: 7-8-1996

ORDER / JUDGMENT

M.A/R.A./C.A. NO. 1

in

O.A.No. 808/96

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.

No Spare Copy

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकारण Central Administrative Tribunal DESPATCH
28 AUG 1996
हैदराबाद बायपीठ HYDERABAD BENCH