

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

O.A.No. 510/97 .

Date of Order 21.4.97

BETWEEN :

Dhananjay Goswamy

.. Applicant.

AND

1. Union of India, rep. by the Secretary to the Govt of India, Ministry of Food Processing, Industries, Panchsheel Bhavan, Khelgao Marg, New Delhi - 110 044.
2. The Director General, Fishery Survey of India, Botawala Chambers, Sir P.M. Road, Mumbai - 400 001.
3. The Zonal Director, Fishery Survey of India, Beach Road, Visakhapatnam - 530 001. .. Respondents.

---

Counsel for the Applicant .. Mr. V. Venkateswara Rao

Counsel for the Respondents .. Mr. V. Vinod Kumar

---

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI R. RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

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

JUDGEMENT

I Oral order as per Hon'ble Shri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, M(J)

---

Heard Mr. V. Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. V. Vinod Kumar, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant herein was initially appointed as Junior Deckhand w.e.f. 12.7.71 and thereafter as Junior Deckhand-cum-Greaser, Senior Deckhand and he was promoted as Senior Deckhand Greaser in the scale of pay of Rs. 975-1540. It is submitted

*Jai*

that he appeared and passed successfully in the examination of Engine Driver of Motor Fishing Vessels conducted by the ~~Marine~~ Department, Government of India. He was issued certificate of competency in the said examination by the Director General of Shipping on 11.6.92. After passing the examination he became eligible for appointment of Chief Engineer Grade-II in the scale of pay of Rs.2375-3500, that he was posted ~~in~~ <sup>to</sup> the said post on adhoc basis intermittantly and that he has filed this OA praying for regularisation of his service as Chief Engineer Gr-II.

3. The grounds urged in this OA are similar to the grounds urged in OA.432/97 decided on 16.4.97. Both the counsels <sup>- binders to the</sup> submit that the directions issued in OA.432/97 may be issued in this case also.

4. The applicant has relied upon the decision in OA. 13/A&N/92 of the Calcutta Bench of this Tribunal and also the decision rendered by Ernakulam Bench in TA.93/87 & 100/87 decided on 26.3.89.

5. Since the representation of the applicant has not been considered by the Respondent No.2 we feel it appropriate to direct the Respondent No.2 to consider the same bearing in mind the principles enunciated by the Calcutta Bench and Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal. The Respondent No.2 shall consider the representation within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and inform the applicant suitably.

6. With these observations, the OA is disposed of. No costs.

7. The applicant is at liberty to approach the Tribunal thereafter if he is aggrieved by the reply to be given by the respondents.

~~( B.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR )~~  
Member (Judl.)

21.4.97

sd

Dated : 21st April, 1997

(Dictated in open court)

~~( R.RANGARAJAN )~~  
Member (Admn.)

~~D.R (S)~~  
7.5.97