

17

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

O.A.No.817/1999.

Date: 14-6-1999.

Between:

Sk. Mastan. Applicant.

And

1. The Chief Personnel Officer,
Rail Nilayam, S.C.Railways,
Secunderabad.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
D.R.M's Office, S.C.Railways,
Vijayawada.
3. The Senior Divisional Personnel
Officer, Divisional Railway Manager's
Office, Personnel Branch,
S.C.Railways, Vijayawada.
4. Assistant Personnel Officer/Engineer-
ing DRM's Office, Personnel Branch,
South Central Railways, Vijayawada.

Counsel for the Applicant: Sri S.Khader Mobiddin.

Counsel for the Respondents: Sri C.V.Malla Reddy.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Sri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)

Hon'ble Sri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J)

O R D E R

(by Hon'ble Sri R.Rangarajan, Member (A))

--

Heard Sri S.Khader Mohiddin, learned counsel for the
Applicant and Sri C.Malla Reddy, learned counsel for the
Respondents.

R

D

The applicant submits that he was in service as Gang Mazdoor/Mazdoor during 1977 and 1980, more particularly from 10.3.1977 to 9.12.1977 for a period of 138 days and also from 23.1.1980 to 9.4.1980 for a period of 67 days under the then P.W.Inspector, S.C.Railway, Eluru. He prays for regularisation of his service ~~during~~ ^{on account of} the periods mentioned above.

This O.A., is filed for a direction to the respondents to appoint the applicant as Kalasi or any other appointment basing on his service as a Mazdoor in the Department.

The applicant submits that his colleagues who worked with him as casual labourers were all absorbed in wagon workshops at Gunturpally and Rayan Padu. If it is so, the applicant ought to have approached the Departmental ^{much earlier} Authorities for regularising his services. If the respondents rejected his claim, he could have filed the O.A., immediately. But the applicant did not take any action. He submits that he was making representations for getting the relief. That repeated representations will not be taken into consideration for curtailing the period of limitation. The applicant submits that his name should have been included in the live register automatically. But it was not done so. The applicant further states that those who were earlier worked along with him were absorbed in response to the notification issued by the Railway.

R

D

But the applicant neither say that he made a representation in pursuance of the said notification, nor did he produce any proof of having submitted his representation in response to the Notification and the respondents have not taken any action on his representation. Hence, the question of including his name in the live register does not arise.

In view of what is stated above, we find no merit in the O.A.

The O.A., is dismissed. No costs.

B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR
(B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)

MEMBER (J)

R. RANGARAJAN

MEMBER (A)

Date: 14-6-1999.

Dictated in open Court.

*Dantu
1645C.*

sss.

Copy to:

1. HONM
2. HHRB M(A)
3. HSSP M(J)
4. D.R. (A)
5. SPARE

Typed By
Compared by

Checked by
Approved by

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: HYDERABAD.

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

THE HON'BLE H. RAJENDRA PRASAD :

THE HON'BLE R. RANGARAJAN ✓
MEMBER (A)

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

DATED: 14-6-99

ORDER/JUDGMENT

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

IN

D.A.N. : 817(99)

ADMITTED AND INTERIM DIRECTIONS
ISSUED.

ALLOWED

DISPOSED OF WITH DIRECTIONS

DISMISSED

DISMISSED AS WITHDRAWN

ORDERED/REJECTED

NO ORDER AS TO COSTS

(8 copies)

