

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH

Dated the Monday 21st day of January Two Thousand And Nineteen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE MR. P.MADHAVAN, MEMBER (J)

M.A.310/00026/2019

In &

O.A. 310/00551/2018

M. Ganesan, aged 66 years,
Senior Telephone Supervisor (O)(Retired),
3/297, Bharathi Nagar, Thuraiyur Road,
M. Pudhupatti, Musiri- 621 211.

....1st Respondent in MA/Applicant in OA

(By Advocate: M/s. N.K. Srinivasan)

Versus

1. Union of India Rep. by
Secretary to Government,
Department of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan, 20-Ashoka Road,
New Delhi- 110 001;
.....2nd Respondent in MA/ 1st Respondent
2. The Chairman and Managing Director,
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited,
Harichandra Mathur Lane, Janpath,
New Delhi- 110 001;
3. The Chief General Manager,
Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited,
Tamilnadu Telecom Circle,
7th Floor, BSNL Admn Bldg.,
No. 16, Greams Road, Chennai- 600 006;
4. The Assistant General Manager (Admn.)
O/o. Principal General Manager, BSNL,
No.1, Bharathidasan Salai,
Trichy- 620 001.

.....Applicants 3, 2 & 1 in MA./Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. G. Prabhakar)

ORAL ORDER

(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member (A))

Heard. It is submitted that the respondents wished to comply with the order dated 10.09.2018 passed in the O.A. and as the procedural formalities are taking time, two months time may be allowed.

3. Learned counsel for the MA respondent would submit that the MA respondent/OA applicant had no objection to time being granted to the respondents to comply with the order of the Tribunal. However, attention is drawn to certain objectionable statements made in the MA, in the background of which the permission sought ought not to be granted. It is alleged that the Tribunal took up the case out of turn in the absence of the counsel for the respondents and passed orders whereas the respondents had shown no urgency to file a reply only with a view to harassing the applicant. Even then, the Tribunal had not passed any orders on merits but only directed the respondents to consider the applicant's claim in the light of the judicial precedents cited therein and pass a reasoned and speaking order to which there could be no objection whatsoever, it is contended.

4. Learned counsel for the MA applicant would submit that the MA applicants seek to withdraw the allegations. Permission may, therefore, be granted in condonation of the same.

5. Keeping in view the above, MA is allowed. The respondents are granted time up to 28.2.2019 to comply with the order.

(P. MADHAVAN)
MEMBER (J)

(R. RAMANUJAM)
MEMBER (A)

21.1.2019