

5-10-2002

MA - 1637/2002

OA - 580/2002

Present: Shri M.K. Shandilay, learned counsel for applicant

Shri George Pasacken, learned counsel for respondents.

We have heard both the learned counsel for parties in MA-1637/2002 (not MA-1632/2002 as wrongly mentioned in the case list). A number of irrelevant and incorrect allegations have been made in the MA, which are not germane to the issue in question. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case and the oral passed by the Tribunal (oral) dated 24-7-2002, we agree with the contentions of Shri George Pasacken, learned counsel that this MA is not maintainable under the provisions of Rule-24 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987. Normally, we would have granted exemplary cost against the applicant.

8

for misuse of the process of law ~~to~~
but refrain from doing so taking into
account the submissions made by the
learned counsel for applicant that the
applicant is handicapped and is not
financially stable at this stage.

With these observations, MA-1637/2002
is dismissed.

V
(V.K. Majotra)
MCA)

JS
(Smt. Lekshmi Sureshwartha
VC (J))