

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.NO.1926/96

HON'BLE JUSTICE CHETTUR SANKARAN NAIR (J), CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE SHRI R.K.AHOJA, MEMBER(A)

New Delhi, this 11th day of September, 1996

R.K.Goyal
Inspector
Central Excise & Customs
Central Excise Commissionerate
New Delhi. Applicant

(By Shri P.P.Khurana, Advocate)

Vs.

1. Union of India
through the Secretary
Ministry of Finance
Department of Revenue
North Block
NEW DELHI.
2. Central Board of Excise & Customs
through its Secretary
North Block
NEW DELHI.
3. Commissioner of Central Excise
Central Excise Commissionerate
New Delhi.
4. Shri S.Raghavendram, Superintendent
5. Shri Lov Dev, Superintendent
6. Shri Ranjeet Singh, Superintendent
7. Suresh Chander Sharma, Superintendent
8. Shri Kuldip Singh, Superintendent
9. Shri Ravi Kant Sudan, Superintendent
10. Shri S.R.Gupta, Superintendent
11. Ashok Walia, Superintendent
12. Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Superintendent

Contd.....2/-

13. Ms. Rita Khanna, Superintendent
14. Shri K.C.Pande, Inspector
15. Ms. Saroj Dave, Inspector
16. Ms. Ahjula Rai Choudhary, Inspector
17. D.D.Kaushik, Inspector

ALL c/o Commissioner of Central Excise
Central Excise Commissionerate
I.P.Estate
NEW DELHI.

... Respondents

The application having been heard
on 11.9.1996 the Tribunal on the
same day delivered the following:

O R D E R

Chettur Sankaran Nair (J), Chairman


Applicant is aggrieved by the denial of seniority to him by A1 order. While working as an Inspector in the Central Excise Collectorate, Bombay, applicant sought and obtained a transfer to Delhi, furnishing an undertaking that he will not claim seniority on the basis of his length of service in the Central Excise Collectorate, Bombay. Relying on the decision of the Tribunal in OA No.601/93 (Damodar Singh Vs. Union of India & Others) applicant submits that the undertaking obtained is not valid in law, as it runs counter to the stipulations in a circular issued by the Government of India. The question whether estoppel would run in the case of orders/circulars issued by Government of India also is a matter which cannot be answered lightly. Likewise, there


Contd....3/-

could be a situation where even legal rights can be waived. Be that as it may, we are not called upon, to answer these issues. As the impugned order is not a speaking order the matter has to be considered properly and a speaking order passed. Applicant is permitted to make a representation before the Government of India setting out his grievances and supporting them with such legal grounds as he may be advised. If he makes a representation, the Union of India will consider the same and pass a speaking order thereon within four weeks from the date of a receipt of the representation and communicate the same to applicant.

The Registrar of this Tribunal will forward a copy of this order to first Respondent, Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, New Delhi.

Dated the 11th September, 1996.


(R.K. AHUJA)
MEMBER(A)


(CHETTUR SANKARAN NAIR(J))
CHAIRMAN

/rao/