

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH: HYDERABAD**

Original Application No.58/2013

Date of Order: 18.04.2019

Between:

L. Venkatesham Goud, S/o. Sri B. Ramaswamy,
Aged about 33 years, Occ: Unemployed,
R/o. H. No. 3-94, Kodakanchi,
PO Madharam, Via Patancheru, Medak Dist.

... Applicant

And

1. Union of India, Rep. by its Chairman & DGOF,
Ordnance Factories Board, 10-A,
S.K. Bose Road, Kolkata – 700 001.
2. The General Manager,
Ordnance Factory,
Yeddu-mailaram PO, Medak Dist – 502 205.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant ... Mr.K. Ram Murthy

Counsel for the Respondents ... Mrs. K. Rajitha, Sr. CGSC

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Member (Admn.)

ORAL ORDER

{As per Hon'ble Mr. Justice L Narasimha Reddy, Chairman}

The respondents issued a notification dated 06.05.2011 inviting applications for various posts. The applicant submitted his application for the post of Millwright. In the written test conducted for that purpose, he emerged successful. However, when it came to the question of issuance of the order of appointment, the respondents faced a roadblock in the form of claim made by persons who were selected for that very posts in the year 1990-92. It is stated that an assurance was given to such candidates by the Department to the effect that they would be accommodated as and when vacancies are available, they were notified, but their cases were not considered. Accordingly, such candidates

filed OA Nos. 1085/2011 & batch and the same were allowed on 13.02.2012 by this Tribunal. Aggrieved by the same, the respondents have WP No. 9070/2012 and on 23.04.2012, Hon'ble High Court permitted the respondents to proceed with the appointments against various categories of posts except the posts of Grinder, Millwright and Turner. The respondents pleaded their inability to select and appoint the applicant in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court.

2. We heard Mr. K. Ram Murthy, learned counsel for the applicant and Mrs. K. Rajitha, learned Sr. CGSC for the respondents.

3. The OA itself is pending for the past six years. The respondents do not dispute the fact that the applicant was successful in the written test. But for the interim order passed by the Hon'ble High Court, the respondents would certainly have processed the case of the applicant. WP No. 9070/2012 is said to be still pending. The proper course for the applicant would be to get himself impleaded in the WP No. 9070/2012 and pursue the remedies. No useful purpose would be served if the OA is kept pending.

4. We therefore, dispose of the OA leaving it open to the applicant to pursue his remedies by getting himself impleaded in the WP No. 9070/2012.

5. There shall be no order as to costs.

(B.V. SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (ADMN.)

(JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN

(Dictated in open court)
Dated, the 18th day of April, 2019

evr