ORDER

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH

--

Wednesday the 14th day of June 2000

--

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice D.H. Nasir, Vice-Chairman

and

The Hon'ble Shri S.MANICKAVASAGAM, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

--

R.A.Nos. 17 of 2000 in OA No.719 of 1999

R.A.No. 18 of 2000 in OA No.742 of 1999

--

R.A.No.17/2000 OA NO.719 of 1999

1. Appi Reddy
2. T.Rama Mohan
3. S.Venkateswara Rao
4. S.Seshatalpa Sai .. Review applicants .. Applicants

R.A.No.18/2000 OA 742/99

1. T.Vijaya Raghava Rao
2. T.Srinivas
3. P.Muttaiah
4. A.Seshagiri Rao
5. R.Chakrapani
6. V.Venkateswarlu
7. R.Srinivas .. Review applicants .. Applicants

Vs.

1. The Union of India rep. by the Chairman Telecom Commission New Delhi-110 001
2. The Chief General Manager A.P.Telecom Circle Abids Hyderabad
3. The Divisional Engineer Microwave Project Vijayawada
4. The sub-Divisional Engineer Installation, Tax Building Vijayawada

.. Respondents in R.A.No.17 of 2000 and O A NO.719/1999

1.The Union of India rep. by the
Chairman, Telecom Commission
New Delhi

2.The Chief General Manager
Andhra Pradesh Telecom Circle
Abids, Hyderabad

3.The Telecom District Manager
Nalgonda

4.The Telecom District Manager
Khammam .. Respondents in R.A. 18 of 2000
and OA No.742/99

Mr.R.Yogender Singh .. Advocate for the review applicants in both the RAs

Mr.Rajeswara Rao .. Advocate for the respondents in R.A.NO.17 of 2000

Mr.B.N.Sharma .. Advocate for the respondents in RA No.18 of 2000

Order: Pronounced by the Hon'ble Shri S.MANICKAVASAGAM
MEMBER(A)

--

We have perused the averments in the affidavit filed in support of the review applications.

2. In the mainOA Nos.719 of 1999 and 742/99 the relief sought for was to permit the applicants to sit for the JTOs examination scheduled in May 1999 by setting aside the impugned order dated 22.3.1999 insisting upon the service limit of five years under the 15% quota.

3. When the main OAs were taken up for final disposal, admittedly the examinations were held as scheduled in the year 1999 and therefore the relief sought for has no relevance. In other words, the OAs have become infructuous. In the reply filed by the respondents in the main OAs, it was averred by the respondents that as per rules, the period of five years experience is mandatory along with other qualifying standards. The OAs were dismissed with an observation that as and when the applicants complete the required qualification both in terms of education or otherwise, they may be called upon to apply for the post of JTO by writing examination etc. In view of the above observations, we do not find any merit in the R.A. Further no error apparent on the face of record has been pointed out in the affidavit filed in support of the R.As. If the applicants want relief which are of different nature, the remedy lies elsewhere and not by filing R.As.

4. In the light of the discussion above, we hold

that these ~~OAs~~ RAs are devoid of merit and are accordingly dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

प्रमाणित प्रति
CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
क्रम संख्या OA 17/2nd C/04 719/88
CASE NUMBER ..... RA 182/94 in OA 744/91
निर्णय का दिनांक
DATE OF JUDGEMENT 12/12/94
प्रति तय्यार करने का दिनांक
COPY MADE READY ON .....

अनुभाग अधिकारी/न्यायालय अधिकारी
Section Officer/Court Officer
केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal
हैदराबाद बायपीठ
HYDERABAD BENCH