

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

C.P.NO.142/2003 in O.A.NO.1176/2002

Tuesday, this the 27th day of May, 2003

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Om Prakash
s/o Shri Parmanand
r/o House No.405
Ward No.16, Ayodhyapuri
Bahadurgarh (Haryana)

. . . Applicant
(By Advocate: Shri S.Mehndi Imam for Shri Anis
Suhrabardy)

Versus

1. R.K.Singh
General Manager
Northern Railway
Baroda House, New Delhi
2. Shivendra Kumar
Controller of Stores
Northern Railway
Baroda House, New Delhi
3. N.K.Sharma
Deputy Controller of Stores
Northern Railway,
Shakurbasti, New Delhi.

. . . Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri R.L.Dhawan)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri Justice V.S.Agarwal:

This Tribunal on 22.10.2002 had disposed of
OA-1176/2002. The operative part of the order reads:-

"8. Noting the above, we dispose of the
OA with directions to file a fresh
letter, indicating all the details, with
specific justification in relation to the
claim of Rs.3,75,638/- within fifteen
days from the date of receipt of a copy
of this order. Respondents shall
consider the same and pass a
reasoned/speaking order, within two
months from the date of receipt of such a
letter. The applicant shall furnish to
the respondents a copy of this OA, which
shall also be taken into consideration
while disposing his claims, keeping in
mind the fact that this is the third
round of litigation. No costs."

(Signature)

3

(2)

2. Respondents' counsel had given the following four cheques to the applicant:-

1. Cheque No.410615 dated 20.5.2003 - Deptt. of Pay 1.1.1996 to 30.10.96 amounting to Rs.3398/-
2. Cheque No.410621 dated 22.5.2003 - TA Sept. & Oct., 1996 amounting to Rs.1929/-
3. Cheque No.410739 dated 22.5.2003 - Provident Fund amounting to Rs.14359/-.
4. Cheque No.409056 dated 9.4.2003 - Leave encashment amounting to Rs.72238/-

Total amount Rs.91,924/-.

and states that a speaking order in this regard has also been passed.

3. Applicant's proxy counsel has accepted the said four cheques without prejudice to his rights to take all the legal and factual pleas available in law and states that he would challenge the order, if so advised.

4. In this view of the matter, rule is discharged. The applicant, if so advised, may take proper legal action in accordance with law.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

/sunil/


(V.S. Aggarwal)
Chairman