

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD

M.A.519/2001 in O.A.590/99

Date of Order : 30.7.2001

BETWEEN :

S.Padma

.. Applicant.

AND

Dy.Director General (Senior),
Geological Survey of India,
Southern Region, Bandlaguda,
Hyderabad - 500 068.

.. Respondent.

— — —

Counsel for the Applicant

.. Mr.S.Ramakrishna Rao

Counsel for the Respondent

.. Ms.Shama Sundari

— — —

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR.M.V.NATARAJAN : MEMBER (ADMN.)

HON'BLE MRS.BHARATI RAY : MEMBER (JUDL.)

— — —
O R D E R

X As per Hon'ble Mr.M.V.Natarajan, Member (A.) X

— — —

Learned counsel for the applicant is present.

2. MA.519/2001 seeks a direction from this Tribunal to implement the orders passed in OA.590/99 dated 1.11.99.

.. 2 ..

3. The orders issued on 1.11.99 even when coming to the conclusion that the applicant's statement that she had worked during the period from 1992-95 was not borne out from the record, a direction was issued to the respondent authorities to extend to her an opportunity for a personal hearing to substantiate her case. Simultaneously the applicant was also advised to produce the details available with her to the respondent authorities to buttress her contention to engage her as a casual labourer in the respondent organisation.

4. Pursuant to these directions the respondent authorities gave an opportunity of being heard to the applicant on 23.1.2001. She gave a representation that she had worked in the Chemical Industry from 1991-96 on regular basis. The respondents have submitted that the applicant failed to produce the evidence in support of her claim to engage her as casual labourer. They have submitted that during 1992, 1993 and 1995 her claim that she had been engaged is false. Accordingly on 17.7.2001 an order had been issued to the applicant informing her that she had not produced any record; *that she had worked* ~~no documents have been produced by her~~ claim and as per the records of the office she had not worked *therefore* during 1992-95 in GSI; *the request made by the applicant* has been regretted.

.. 3 ..

5. Thus we find no merit in this MA. Accordingly
MA is dismissed. No costs.

Bharati Ray
(BHARATI RAY)
Member(Judl.)

M. V. Natarajan
(M.V. NATARAJAN)
Member(Admn.)

Dated : 30th July, 2001

(Dictated in Open Court)

sd

3171001

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD

COPY TO:-

1ST AND 2ND COURT

1. HVRG. : VICE CHAIRMAN

TYED BY
COMARED BY

CHECKED BY Q
APPROVED BY

2. HMVN : MEMBER (ADMN) ✓

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAJA GOPALA
REDDY: VICE CHAIRMAN

3. HSKA : MEMBER (ADMN)

4. HBR : MEMBER (JUDL)

THE HON'BLE MR. V. NATARAJAN: MEMBER
(ADMN)

5. DEPUTY REGISTRAR (A) ✓

THE HON'BLE MRS. BHARATI RAY: MEMBER
(JUDL)

6. SPARE ✓

7. ADVOCATE

8. STANDING COUNSEL

DATE OF ORDER 30/7/2001

MA/RAY/CP. No. 5 (9) 2001
IN

OA. No. 590/99

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS
ISSUED.

ALLOWED

C. B. CLOSED

DISPOSED OF

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISPOSED OF WITHDRAWN

M A DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERD ACCORDINGLY

REJECTED

DISMISSED AS INFRACTIOUS

DISMISSED FOR DEFAULT

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

WITH COSTS.

Records/Posting/Notice/Scrutiny

