

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

OA.No.727/95

10

Dated this the 6th Day of February, 1996.

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Member(A)

Hon'ble Dr. A.Vedavalli, Member(J)

G. Suresh Kumar,  
S/o Shri V. Ganapathy,  
Junior Stenographer,  
Delhi College of Engineering,  
Delhi.

Applicant

Applicant in person.

versus

1. Union of India through  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Director,  
Directorate of Estates,  
Ministry of Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.

3. Assistant Director of Estates,  
Directorate of Estates,  
Ministry of Urban Development,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi

Respondents

By Advocate: Mrs. Pratima Kumar Gupta.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Member(A))

The applicant who is the son of Shri V. Ganapathy, a junior Stenographer in the Delhi College of Engineering, Delhi, has impugned the order dated 18.6.93 issued by the Estate Officer, Directorate of Estates, New Delhi under Section 5(1) of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971, calling upon Shri V. Ganapathy, allottee of the Government Quarter No.238, Lodhi Road Complex, New Delhi to evict the quarter, failing which, he will be forcibly evicted.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents has invited our attention to the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 16.10.95, whereby, it has been <sup>stated</sup> that Shri V. Ganapathy had retired on 31.7.89 and

A

his son Shri Suresh Kumar ie. the present applicant, who was not in an eligible category of entitlement when his father Shri Ganapathy had applied for transfer of the house in his name, has now been transferred to Maulana Azad Medical College.

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed the Additional Solicitor General Shri Tulsi to consider the representation made by the son (present applicant), if made within one week from today, and decide the case.

4. Shri Suresh Kumar states that pursuant to the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 16.10.95, he had made a representation to the concerned authorities within the prescribed period, which was forwarded by the Additional Solicitor General. It is stated that the above representation is still pending consideration.

5. In the light of the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 16.10.95, the present OA cannot be considered by us on merits and hence, the same is dismissed as having become infructuous. *No costs*

A. Vedavalli  
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)

MEMBER(J)

S. R. Adige  
(S. R. ADIGE)  
MEMBER(A)

/kam/