

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

**Original Application No. 496/2019**

**Date of Order : 04.06.2019**

**Between :**

V.Prakashbabu,  
S/o G.Venkateshwarlu, Occ : UDC,  
Aged about 54 years,  
O/o Executive Engineer, Hyderabad Project Division,  
CPWD, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad – 500 050,  
R/o H.No.2-140/8, Raj Nagar Colony,  
Uppal, Hyderabad – 500 039.  
Telangana State.

... Applicant

**And**

1.Union of India, Represented by  
The Director General of Works,  
Central P.W.D., Nirman Bhavan,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

2. The Additional Director General (SR-I),  
Southern Region, Central P.W.D.,  
Rajaji Bhavan, Besant Nagar,  
Chennai – 600 090, Tamilnadu.

3. The Chief Engineer (SZ-II),  
C.P.W.D, Nirman Bhawan,  
Sultan Bazar, Koti, Hyderabad – 500 095.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant	...	Mr. K.Ram Murthy, Advocate
Counsel for the Respondents	...	Mrs.K.Rajitha, Sr.CGSCS

**CORAM:**

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

**ORAL ORDER**

***[ As per Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman ]***

The applicant is working as UDC in Hyderabad Project Division of C.P.W.D. Through an order dated 21.05.2019 he was transferred to Tirupati Project Zone, Tirupati. The same is challenged in this OA. The applicant contends that in accordance with the Policy framed by the Government, the department had issued a readiness list for effecting transfers in respect of LDCs / UDCs in the South Region – I on 10.01.2019 and options were called for from the officials named therein to choose three places and that his name did not figure therein. He contends that when the department had decided to publish a readiness list to ensure objectivity and transparency in the transfers and to avoid hardship to the employees, there is absolutely no basis to transfer him without including his name in the list. Another contention of the applicant is that there are dozens of UDCs working at the same place for decades together and without touching them he has been transferred.

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

4. The Government framed the Transfer Policy which contains several guidelines. One of it is that, the readiness list of the employees who became liable to be transferred, as per the norms, shall be published well in advance. The tenure of the employees working at a station is indicated and they in turn are required to choose three stations of their choice, for the purpose of posting. Such a list, covering the posts of LDCs / UDCs was published on 10.01.2019. A perusal of the same discloses that some UDCs are continuing in the same station mostly in Chennai, for periods exceeding three decades. The tenure of the applicant in the present station is said to be 10 years. The respondents did not include the name of the applicant in the readiness list obviously because his tenure in the preset station is relatively less. The names of 17 UDCs working in various offices in SZ-II, Hyderabad are mentioned. The longest tenure is of one Yeleti Gangadhara Rao, 35 years 42 days and the lowest is of Mogili Kalpana, 12 years 59 days.

5. Having not included the name of applicant in the readiness list, the respondents have transferred the applicant through the impugned order

dated.21.05.2019. On account of such an exercise, the very purpose of publishing the readiness list is defeated. The impugned order does not contain any names of UDCs working even more than three decades of the service at the same station. The whole exercise, vis-a-vis the applicant is contrary to the prescribed procedure and norms.

6. We, therefore, allow the OA. The impugned order dated 21.05.2019 is set aside. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

**(JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY)**  
**CHAIRMAN**

sd