

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:  
AT HYDERABAD

(32)

O.A. No. 750 of 1997

Date of Decision:  
20th November, 1997

Between:

M.A. Qayum

.. Applicant

AND

1. The Chairman, Railway Board,  
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Hyderabad Division, South Central  
Railway, Secunderabad.
4. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Nanded Sub-division, South Central  
Railway, Nanded, Maharashtra.
5. The Chief Personnel Manager,  
South Central Railway,  
Rail Nilayam, Secunderabad.

.. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. P. Bhasker

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr. V. Rajeswar Rao

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SRI H. RAJENDRA PRASAD: MEMBER (ADMN.)

ORDER

(Per Hon'ble Sri H. Rajendra Prasad: Member (Admn.))

1. Heard Mr. B.S.A. Satyanarayana on behalf of  
Mr. P. Bhasker for the Applicant and Mr. V. Rajeswar Rao  
for the Respondents.

2. The applicant in this OA is aggrieved on 4 counts:-

Q/POL

(3)

1. Deduction of house rent from his pay in respect of the quarter allotted to him which, according to the applicant, was never occupied by him during his entire tenure as Station Master, Nandpur Railway Station.
2. Non-payment of house rent allowance for certain periods even though such allowance was given for portions of the same period.
3. Non-payment/non-sanction of over-time allowance for the work performed by him in excess of his normal allotted duties.
4. Non-sanction of compensation for the extra work performed by him on account of non-provision of a suitable quarter even though Nandpur Railway Station was termed an Essential Intermittant Station.
3. The Respondents have explained to a certain extent the position with reference to each of the above grievances. No opinion is, however, expressed in this order about their submissions in the counter affidavit.
4. It is contended by Mr. Rajeswar Rao that the case suffers from delays, limitation and latches. It is pointed out that the applicant has raised a claim long after his retirement while his grievances pertain to 1988 to 1991. The applicant approached the Labour Enforcement Officer at Chandrapur at one stage although that officer was in no way directly concerned with his complaint. In any case it was submitted by the Standing Counsel that no communications were at all received from the said Officer. Next, the applicant merely sent a legal notice to various authorities. In the midst of all this frenetic activity the applicant singularly

(34)

failed to project his case to his own Superior authorities at any stage during the entire period.

5. In reply to the above, it is submitted by Mr. Satyanarayana that the applicant, if granted permission to do so, proposes now to file a representation to R-3 (DRM-Secunderabad). He is permitted to do so within the next 3 weeks. The Respondent No.3 may have the representation, if submitted and received within the time indicated, examine the same with reference to such of the records that may be available to determine as to whether the applicant is at all entitled to receive any claim projected by him. The case may be examined as per rules and with the aid of available records. A decision shall thereafter be communicated to the applicant within 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of the representation.

Thus the OA is disposed of.

\_\_\_\_ H. Rajendra Prasad  
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)

Date: 20th November, 1997

Dictated in the open court.

*M.M.* Deputy Registrar

KSM

O.A.750/97.

To

1. The Chairman, Railway Board,  
    Railbhavan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, SC Rly,  
    Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
    Hyderabad Division, SC Rly Secunderabad.
4. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
    Nanded Sub Division, SC Rly, Nanded,  
    Maharashtra.
5. The Chief Personnel Manager,  
    SC Rly, Railnilayam, Secunderabad.
6. One copy to Mr. P. Bhaskar, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Mr. V. Rajeswar Rao, Sdfor Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
8. One copy to HHRP.M.(A) CAT.Hyd.
9. One copy to D.R.(A) CAT.Hyd.
10. One spare copy.

pym.

10 COPIES

I Court

TYPED BY:

CHECKED BY:

COMPARED BY:

APPROVED BY:

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE.  
VICE-CHAIRMAN

And

THE HON'BLE MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD :M(A)

DATED:-

20/11/97

ORDER/JUDGMENT.

M.A.,/RA.,/C-A.NO.

in

O.A.NO.

750/97

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.

