

25

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

O.A.NO.

536 | 99

Date of Order : 31.3.99

BETWEEN :

1. V. Lakshminarayana
2. I. Prasada Rao
3. K. Uma Shankar
4. P. Venkateswarlu
5. N. S. S. Kumar

.. Applicants.

AND

1. General Manager,
S.C.Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
2. Senior Deputy General
Manager and Chief Vigilance Officer
S.C.Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
3. Chief Mechanical Engineer,
S.C.Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.
4. Divisional Railway Manager (P),
S.C.Railway, Vijayawada.
5. Sr. Divisional Mechanical Engineer,
S.C.Railway, C&W, Vijayawada.
6. D.S.P. Murthy
7. K. Panduranga Rao
8. Ch. Sambasiva Rao
9. Vinukonda Omkaram

.. Respondents

— — —

Counsel for the Applicants

.. Mr. K. K. Chakravarthy

Counsel for the Respondents

.. Mr. N. R. Devraj

— — —

CORAM :

HON'BLE SHRI R. Rangarajan, Member (Admn.)

Hon'ble Shri B. S. Jai Parameshwar, Member (Judl.)

R

D

.. 2 ..

O R D E R

X As per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (Admn.) X

Mr. K.K.Chakravarthy, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr.N.R.Devraj, learned standing counsel for the respondents.

2. There are 5 applicants in this OA. They are aspirants ^{for} for promotion to the Intermediate Apprentice TXR's conducted on 12.12.98.

3. This OA is filed for a declaration that the selection process held by the respondents to the post of Intermediate Apprentice J.E./II/C&W in the scale of Rs.5000-8000 (RSRP)against the 25% departmental quota LDCE in mechanical (C&W) Department on Bezawada Division was in accordance with the norms and the memo dated 29.12.98 is valid and consequently direct the respondents 2 to 5 to release the panel by appointing the applicants to the post.

4. Earlier a set of staff who ^{Were} ~~are~~ also aspirants for the above said post filed OA.86/99 on the file of this Bench which was disposed of on 8.1.99. Paras 3 and 4 of that judgement is relevant. It is reproduced below :-

"In our opinion this is a fit case which should receive the attention of SDGM and Chief Vigilance Officer, with a view to clearing-up suspicions which seems to hang around the conduct of the said examination and the manner of selections. We need scarcely add that it is hardly in the interests of department

R

A

.. 3 ..

to allow such suspicions to remain uninvestigated. This should be done early and such follow-up action as may be called for - depending on the findings of the enquiry - should be ordered, including, if necessary, the cancellation of the examination and rescinding of the results.

The OA is disposed of in terms of the above observation, and with a further direction that the result of recently concluded Intermediate Apprentice TXR Examination shall not be declared prior to the final clearance of SDGM".

5. The respondents should take expeditious action as directed above in finalising the examination. In any case the final decision should be taken within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. The OA is ordered accordingly. No costs.

46
(E.S. JAI PARAMESHWAR)

Member (Judl.)

31/3/99

Me
(R.RANGARAJAN)

Member (Admn.)

Dated : 31st March, 1999

(Dictated in Open Court)

*Amulya
Jee*

sd

Copy to:

1. HONM

1ST AND 2ND COURT

TYPED BY
COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY
APPROVED BY

2. HHRP M(A)

THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD.

3. HOSDP M(J)

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.H. NASIR:
VICE - CHAIRMAN

4. D.R. (A)

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

5. SPARE

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

THE HON'BLE MR. B.S. JAI PARAMESWAR
MEMBER (J)

DATED: 31/3/99

ORDER/ JUDGEMENT

MA./RA./CP. NO.

IN

O.A. NO. 536/99

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS
ISSUED.

ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/ REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

SRR

9 copy

