

29

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

OA.838/96

dt.5-3-97

Between

A. Murali Manohar : Applicant

and

Secretary  
Government of India  
Dept. of Personnel & Training  
North Block, New Delhi

2. Under Secretary  
Govt. of India,  
Dept. of Personnel & Training  
North Block, New Delhi

3. Union public Service Commission, rep. by its Secretary  
Dholpur House, Shahjahan Road  
New Delhi 110011

4. S.V. Kasi Vishweswara Rao  
R/o 54-C, Vengalraonagar  
Hyderabad 500038 : Respondents

Counsel for the applicant : A. Satya Prasad  
Advocate

Counsel for the respondents : N.R. Devaraj  
Sr. CGSC

CORAM

HON. MR. JUSTICE MG CHAUDHARI, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON. MR. H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.)

## Judgement

Oral order (per Hon. Mr. Justice M.G. Chaudhari, VC )

Mr. A. Satya Prasad for the applicant. Mr. N.R. Devaraj for the respondents.

1. Pursuant to our direction dated 5-2-1997 Mr. Sivasailam Dy. Secretary to Govt. of India, Department of Personnel and Training, has appeared and has tendered a detailed note on the basis of which the learned senior standing counsel has made his submissions. In the light of the note we heard the submissions of Mr. Satya Prasad, the learned counsel for the applicant.

✓ 2. In the position emerging from the discussion that took place it was found extremely difficult to grant any relief to the applicant. We may add that we feel sorry for the applicant who has been victim of unfortunate situation where in despite having passed the examination he is unable to get allocation for want of vacancy. For a person like the applicant this would be a frustrating experience. We have therefore examined the question involved very meticulously in order to find out whether we ~~can~~ <sup>to</sup> can extend some helping hand to the applicant. We have <sup>to</sup> regret that we are unable to do so within the frame work of the law.

✓ 3. The learned counsel for the applicant realising the utter futility of inviting an uncalled for adverse ~~position~~ <sup>decision</sup> had consultation with the applicant and we are now informed that the applicant seeks withdrawal of the OA. In this ~~the~~ circumstances we feel that the applicant has been well advised in making this request.

4. In the result, on the application made on behalf of the applicant, the OA is allowed to be withdrawn and is



O.A.878/96

To

1. The Secretary, Govt.of India,  
Dept.of Personnel and Training,  
North Block, New Delhi.
2. The Under Secretary,  
Govt.of India, Dept.of Personnel  
and Training, North Block, New Delhi.
3. The Secretary, U.P.S.C. Shahjahan Road,  
Dholpur House, New Delhi-11.
4. One copy to MR.A.Satya Prasad, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr.N.R.Devraj, Sr.CGSC. CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to D.R.(A) CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.

pvm.

28/4/97

I COURT

TYED BY

CHECHED 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  
MEMBER(ADMN)

Dated: 5 -3 -1997

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 838/96

T.A.No. (W.P. )

Admitted and Interim Directions  
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for defayit.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

