IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

***

O.A.1195/97.   Dt. of Decision : 12-09-97.

T.Bharathi Devi   .. Applicant.

Vs

1. The Union of India rep. by its Secretary, Min.of Communications, Dept. of Telecommunications, New Delhi-110 001.

2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunication, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad-500 001.

3. The General Manager, Telecommunications, Rajahmundry, East Godavari District.   .. Respondents.

Counsel for the applicant : MR.B.S.A.Satyanarayana

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

CORAM:-

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

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

*****

ORDER

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

Heard Mr.B.S.A.Satyanarayana, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.N.R.Devaraj, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. This OA is filed praying for a direction to the respondents to treat the applicant on par with the Telephone Supervisors and for a consequential ~~kxxx~~ direction to the respondents to confer upon her the same benefits of promotion that are available to the Telephone Supervisors with due protection of seniority and pay of the applicant.

3. The applicant has submitted a representation dated 24-07-96 (Annexure-2) for fixation of her seniority along with Telephone Supervisors (in the grade of Rs.1400-2300/-) and for grant of consequential benefits.

4. The applicant while working as Observation Supervisor was asked to give her option to join the category of Telephone Supervisor on the basis of a Scheme. The applicant submits that she was not given that option. But her representation does not give that impression. In any case she wants fixation of seniority in Telephone Supervisor now on the basis of her representation. No definite direction can be given in this connection as the whole case has to be examined in detail from the stage of calling option from the Observation Supervisor to come into the cadre of Telephone Supervisor. However the learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the representation of the applicant dated 24-07-96 (Annexure-2) may be disposed of by the respondents and to that effect a direction may be given at this juncture. The learned counsel for the respondents also submitted that he has no objection if a direction is given to dispose of her representation dated 24-07-96(Annexure-2) in accordance with law. As there is unanimity in the views of both the sides we feel it will be unnecessary to further go into various aspects of this case and leave it to the department to decide her representation in accordance with law.

5. In the result, R-2 is directed to dispose of the representation of the applicant dated 24-07-96(Annexure-2) in accordance with law expeditiously. No costs.

(B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)
MEMBER(JUDL.)

(R. RANGARAJAN)
MEMBER(ADMN.)

12/9(9)

Dated : The 12th Sept. 1997.
(Dictated in the Open Court)

spr

D.R(J) 18-9-97

(25)

OA. 1195/97

1. The Secretary, Min. of Communications, Dept. of Telecommunications, New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunication, AP. Circle, Hyderabad.
3. The General Manager, Telecommunications, Rajahmundry, East Godavari Dist.
4. One copy to BSA.Satyanarayana, Advocate, CAT., Hyd.
5. One copy to Mr. N.R.Devaraj, Sr.CGSC., CAT., Hyd.
6. One copy to DR(A), CAT., Hyd.
7. One spare.

अग्रि 23/9/97

(7)

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD

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

AND

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

DATED: 12/9/97

ORDER/JUDGEMENT

M.A./R.A/C.A.NO.

in

O.A.NO. 1195/97

Admitted and Interim directions Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions,

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

YLKR

II Court.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal
प्रेषण /DESPATCH
24 SEP 1997
हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ
HYDERABAD BENCH