

(22)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

O.A.NO 1333/96.

Date of Order: 18-11-96.

Between:

Esuf Devalasab Guled Gud.

Applicant.

and

1. Union of India, rep. by General Manager,
SC Rly, Railnilayam, Secunderabad-A.P.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer, SC Rly,
Railnilayam, Secunderabad, A.P.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager (Personnel),
SC Rly, Hubli Division, Hubli, Karnataka.

Respondents.

For the Applicant: Mr. P. Rameshiah, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. V. Rameswar Rao, SC for Rlys.

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE MR. RAJENDRA PRASAD : MEMBER (ADMIN)

The Tribunal made the following Order:-

Annexure-A-I dt. 2.8.1988 issued by the Traffic Inspector, S.C. Rly, Madgaon prima facie indicates that the name of the applicant was borne in the live register and C.L. Card No. was 50. Annexure A-II shows that the applicant was described as substitute and was stopped from working. That annexure is dt. 19-4-1988. It is stated that about the year 1995 the applicant noticed that some other disengaged workers whose names were in the live register were being re-engaged under certain policy decision. At Annexure A-III to the O.A. is a purported copy of a representation-cum-application filed by the applicant to the Chief Personnel Officer, SC Rly, Secunderabad requesting for consideration of his case for re-engagement. The said representation bears the date 26-11-95. This representation has now been referred to in the O.A. Similarly, although it is averred that repeated representations and personal approaches were made that averment is entirely vague. We are therefore not sure whether the so-called representation dt. 25-11-1995 was filed. Having regard to the circumstance that the name of the applicant was entered in the live register at one time and as the applicant believed that re-engagement is now being undertaken we think that the Chief Personnel Officer may examine the request of the applicant in accordance with the law and prevailing rules and policy guidelines and inform the applicant whether he can be re-engaged or not. We therefore direct the Chief Personnel Officer to deal with the representation dt. 25-11-1995.

In the result, the following order is passed:-

Even if the representation dated 25-11-95 (Annexure A-III) may or may not be on the file of the Respondent No.2, he is directed to treat the said annexure as the representation dated 25-11-95 and dispose it of within a period of two months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order in accordance with the law, the applicable rules and the policy guidelines in the matter. The decision taken in the matter shall be communicated to the applicant.

The O.A. is disposed of at the admission stage in terms of the aforesaid directions.

Amalini
26-11-86
Deputy Registrar(J)CC

1. The General Manager,
Union of India, SC Rly, Railnilayam,
Secunderabad..
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
SC Rly, Railnilayam, Secunderabad, A.P.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager(Personnel)
SC Rlys.Hubli Division, Hubli, Karnataka.
4. One copy to Mr. P.Rathaiah, Advocate, CAT.Hyd
5. One copy to Mr. V.Rajeswar Rao, SC for Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
6. Onespere copy.

pvm.

3/12/96 (25)

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: 18 - 11 - 1996

ORDER / JUDGMENT

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

in

O.A.No. 1333/96

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

Handwritten signature: *As per govt to n2*
Central Administrative Tribunal
DESPATCH
28 NOV 1996
HYDERABAD BENCH