

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

D.A. NO. 1564 of 1995

New Delhi this the 6th day of September, 1995.

HON'BLE SHRI N. V. KRISHNAN, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (D)

Tilak Ram,
Head Security Guard,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad. ... Applicant

(By Shri M. C. Dhingra)

-Versus-

1. Union of India through
Secretary, Ministry of
Commerce, Udyog Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Development Commissioner,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
3. Deputy Development Commissioner,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
4. Administrative Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
5. Security Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
6. Shri R. P. Verma,
Assistant Security Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
7. Shri Ramesh Chand,
Assistant Security Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
8. Shri Baljeet Singh,
Assistant Security Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad.
9. Shri Soratan Singh,
Assistant Security Officer,
NOIDA Export Processing Zone,
NOIDA, Distt. Ghaziabad. ... Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri N. V. Krishnan, VC (A) :-

ll

3

We have heard the learned counsel for applicant. It appears that by the Annexure R-6 memorandum dated 23.3.1995 a notice has been given to one Baljeet Singh who, it is stated, was wrongly promoted as Assistant Security Officer by the order dated 21.10.1994, Annexure R-4. The learned counsel does not know whether the said Baljeet Singh has since been reverted. However, he states that Baljeet Singh has filed an O.A. in the Allahabad Bench of the Tribunal and according to his information, the operation of the order dated 23.3.1995 has been stayed.

2. The applicant apprehends that after Baljeet Singh is reverted, the respondents intend to fill up that post by direct recruitment which is against the recruitment rules for this post, which is reserved for a promotee and that too for a SC, which the applicant is. He, therefore, requests that notice be issued to the respondents.

3. If, as the applicant states, the Annexure R-6 notice has been stayed by the Allahabad Bench of the Tribunal, there is no basis for the apprehension for until Baljeet Singh is reverted, the question of filling up that post does not arise.

4. In the circumstances, learned counsel for the applicant seeks permission to withdraw the application at present to seek available remedies and to approach the Tribunal whenever a grievance arises. The prayer is accepted. The D.A. is dismissed as withdrawn *on the above terms*.

A. Vedavalli
(Dr. A. Vedavalli)
Member (J)

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