

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

CP No.446/2002 in
OA No.707/2001

New Delhi this the 3rd day of December, 2002.

HON'BLE MR. V.K. MAJOTRA, MEMBER (ADMNV)
HON'BLE MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Jatinder Kumar,
Junior Telecom Officer,
R/o 2349, Sector 16,
Faridabad (HRO.

-Petitioner

(By Advocate Shri S.N. Anand)

-Versus-

1. Sh. Vinod Vaish, Secretary,
Ministry of Communications
(Department of Telecom),
Sanchar Bhawan,
20, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi-110001.

2. Sh. K.H. Khan,
The Chief General Manager,
Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited,
Khurshid Lal Bhawan,
New Delhi-110050.

-Respondents

(By Advocate Shri V.K. Rao)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Shri V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

OA-707/2001 was partly allowed by order dated
14.3.2002 with the following directions:-

"OA is partly allowed with a direction to the respondents that they shall consider the case of the applicant for ad hoc promotion as per instructions contained in paragraph 5 of the OM dated 14.9.92 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs".

2. Learned counsel of the applicant has stated that respondents have not delivered any orders to the applicant passed in pursuance of Tribunal's order. He pointed out that Annexure-A dated 28.10.2002 attached with reply of the

h

respondents is addressed by Office of the Chief General Manager Telephone, Khurshid Lal Bhawan to the General Manager (Law), MTNL, New Delhi stating that applicant had not been found fit for ad hoc promotion, has not been addressed to the applicant and as such the respondents have not passed any order in pursuance of Tribunal's order mentioned above. Learned counsel of the respondents stated that Annexure-A dated 28.10.2002 attached with the reply is the order passed in pursuance of Tribunal's order rejecting applicant's claim for ad hoc promotion, copy of the same had been endorsed to the applicant. We are satisfied that respondents have passed orders in compliance of the directions of this court. Although they have endorsed a copy of that order to the applicant, it may be that he has not received the same. Be that as it may, the Annexure-A dated 28.10.2002 is the relevant order passed by the respondents in compliance of the directions of this court. If the applicant is still aggrieved, he has liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

3. C.P. 446/2002 is dismissed. Notices issued to the respondents are discharged.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

V.K. Majotra
(V.K. Majotra)
Member (A)

cc.