

(10)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

C.P. No. 183/95
O.A No. 271/94

Date of decision 7.9.95

Hon'ble Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman(A)
Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Shri Babu Lal,
s/o Shri Matadean,
c/o Shri Chiranji Lal,
Welding Shop,
Railway Road Circle,
Palam Colony,
Palam(New Delhi)

.... Petitioner

(By Advocate Shri B.N.Bhargava)

Versus

1. Sh. V.K. Aggarwal,
General Manager,
Northern Railway, Baroda House,
New Delhi.
2. Shri R.M. Aggarwal,
Divisional Railway Manager,
Northern Railway Division,
BIKANER (Rajasthan)
3. Shri Ashok Kumar,
Sr. Divisional Engineer,
Northern Railway Division,
BIKANER (Rajasthan)

.... Respondents

O R D E R (FINAL)

(Hon'ble Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman(A))

We have seen the affidavit filed by Shri B.N.Bhargava, learned counsel for the applicant. We had directed the learned counsel for the applicant that the name of the 3rd respondent in the petition has been improperly recorded. In the petition the name is mentioned as Ashok Kumar, Senior Divisional Engineer, Northern Railway Division, Bikaner (Rajasthan) whereas, in our original order the 3rd respondent was designated as Divisional Engineer, Northern Railway Division, Bikaner (Rajasthan). The order dated 15-9-94 gave direction to respondent No.3 for compliance. We, therefore, point^{ed} out to the learned

u

counsel for the petitioner that 3rd respondent in the petition will only be the Divisional Engineer.

2. In this regard, learned counsel sought permission to file an affidavit. That affidavit has been filed. It is stated in the OA, that respondent No.3 was shown as Divisional Engineer but now been promoted as Senior Divisional Engineer, Bikaner under the control of respondent No.2 who is equally responsible for the implementation of the judgment.

3. We had already held that the name of the respondents 1 and 2 ^{have been} ~~have been~~ deleted from the petition because no directions were issued to them. In so far as respondent No.3 is concerned, the party now impleaded is quite different from the party to whom direction was given for compliance.

4. In the circumstances, we find that this petition is not maintainable it is, therefore, dismissed.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

N.V. Krishnan
7.9.95
(N.V. Krishnan)
Vice Chairman (A)

sk