

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.912/96

DATE OF ORDER : 17-09-1998.

Between :-

Syed Mohamood Rahman

... Applicant

And

1. Sr.Divisional Personnel Officer,
S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
2. Sr.Divisional Commercial Manager,
S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
3. General Manager,
S.C.Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Sec'bad.
4. Smt.A.Sujatha

... Respondents

--- --- ---

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri G.V.Subba Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Bhimanna, CGSC

--- --- ---

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

T

--- --- ---

... 2.

D

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

40

-- -- --

Heard Sri G.V.Subba Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri V.Bhimanna, learned standing counsel for the respondents. Notice served on Respondent No.4 but called absent.

2. This OA is filed to set aside the order dt.18-7-96 whereby Respondent No.4 was promoted as Head Clerk in the scale of pay of Rs.1400-2300 by holding the same as illegal, arbitrary and for a consequential direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to promote the applicant against the vacancy of Head Clerk in the scale of pay of Rs.1400-2300 in view of the fact that the applicant is senior to Respondent No.4.

3. When the OA was taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant had already been promoted as Head Clerk and his seniority in the Head Clerk cadre is given effect to above that of Respondent No.4. However, he requests that his promotion should be deemed to have been effected from the date on which Respondent No.4 was given. In view of the fact that the applicant had been promoted as Head Clerk and also given the seniority above that of Respondent No.4, no other prayer needs to be examined in this OA.

4. The applicant is at liberty to file a representation if he so desires for showing him as promoted on par with Respondent No.4 to the appropriate respondent authorities and that respondent authority shall decide the representation in accordance





....3.

with the law.

5. The Original Application is disposed of as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR
(B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)
Member (J)
18.9.98

R.RANGARAJAN
(R.RANGARAJAN)
Member (A)

D.R
21-9-98

Dated: 18th September, 1998.
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/

DA.912/96

Copy to:-

1. The Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
2. The Sr. Divisional Commercial Manager, S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
3. The General Manager, S.C.Railway, Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. G.V.Subba Rao, Advocate, CAT., Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. V.Bhimanna, Addl.CGSC., CAT, Hyd.
6. One copy to D.R.(A), CAT., Hyd.
7. One duplicate copy.

srr

23/10/98

(A)

II COURT

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI B. S. JAI PARAMESWAR :
M(J)

DATED: 17/10/98

ORDER/JUDGMENT

M.A.R.A./C.P.H.O.

C.A. NO. 912/98

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS
ISSUED

ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

DISMISSED FOR DEFAULT

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

YLR

