

(1)
(3) A

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

O.A. NO.2425/1994

HON'BLE MR. R.K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

New Delhi, this 4th November, 1996.

1. Shri Jai Kishan
Under Divisional Cashier (P)
Northern Railways
New Delhi.

R/o Railway Quarter No.78-B/
Motia Bagh
New Delhi - 54.

...Applicant

(through Shri R.K. Relan, Advocate)

Vs.

1. General Manager
Northern Railways
Baroda House
New Delhi.

2. FA & Chief Accounts Officer (Adm.)
Northern Railways
Baroda House
New Delhi.

3. Chief Cashier
Northern Railways
New Delhi.

4. Divisional Cashier (P)
Northern Railways
New Delhi.

5. Divisional Supdt./Engineer/Estate
Northern Railways
D.R.M. Office
New Delhi. ... Respondents

through Shri D.S. Mahindru, proxy
for Shri P.S. Mahindru, counsel
for the Respondents)

ORDER
(ORAL)

This Applicant is aggrieved by the impugned
orders dated 19.9.94 and 21.11.94 transferring him
out of Delhi.

contd. ... 2/-

Re

Ex-
35

2. The Respondents have since, vide their SSO No.4, dated 16.1.96, modified the impugned order of 21.11.94 and ordered for his detention in Delhi at his request. The learned counsel for the Applicant stated that no orders have been passed by the Respondents as to how the period intervening between 24.11.94 and 16.1.96 would be treated and no salary or allowances have been paid to him since January 1995. On 28.8.96, when the matter came up before the Bench, the learned counsel for the Respondents was asked to ascertain as to how the Respondents propose to deal with the aforesaid period. Today, when the matter came up, the 1d. proxy counsel submitted that he has not been able to find out the position from his client.

3. Having heard both the parties, I feel that the matter can be disposed of with the direction to Respondent No.2 to decide within a period of one month from the receipt of a certified copy of this order regarding the treatment of the aforesaid period and make payment of such dues as may be admissible to the Applicant within a period of one month thereafter.

4. The O.A. is disposed of with the aforesaid direction. The Applicant would be at liberty to agitate the matter in case he is not satisfied with the order of Respondent No.2, as directed above, in accordance with law. No costs.

/avi/

R.K. AHOOJA
(R.K. AHOOJA)
MEMBER (A)