

(7)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

QA NO. 909/2000

New Delhi, this 11th day of January 2001.

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S Tampi, Member (A)

1. Shri Bilendar Ram S/o Sh. Nathuni Ram
R/O A-657 F, Sector-11, Vijay Nagar,
Gaziabad.

2. Raj Kumar Sarsawat, S/o
Jagdish Prasad Sarsawat,
Village Banse, PO Nagora,
Distt. Mathura.

.....Applicants

(By Advocate Shri S. K. Sawhney)

Vs

1. Union of India through
Chairman, Railway Board,
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Chairman, Railway Recruitment Board,
Ajmer, Rajasthan.

3. General Manager (E)
Western Railway, Church Gate,
Mumbai, Maharashtra.

.....Respondents.

(None for the Respondents)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, VC(J)

Shri S.K. Sawhney, learned counsel for applicant. None has appeared for respondents on the last several days when the case was listed. We further note that respondent No. 2 is the Chairman Railway Recruitment Board, Ajmer (Rajasthan), and respondent No. 3 is the General Manager, Western Railway, Mumbai. Perhaps, it is for this reason that in spite of notices being issued to the respondents, no reply has been filed so far.

.....2/-

18/

2. Shri S.K. Sawhney, learned counsel for the applicant submits that Respondent No.1, Chairman, Railway Board, New Delhi has issued a letter recently to the applicant with regard to his grievances. We note from Annexure A-1 letter dated 19.12.1997 issued by Respondent No.2 Chairman, Railway Recruitment Board (RRB) Ajmer, that reference has been made to the application received from applicant No. 1, in which they have stated that in case he is found eligible for appointment they will be sending him the appointment letter. Shri S.K. Sawhney, learned counsel submits that the same situation applies to applicant No.2. From the grounds it is seen that the main grievance of the applicants is that the respondents are taking an unduly long time in giving effect to the panel declared by the RRB Ajmer, and denying them appointments to the post of Supervisor (P.Way), for which they were selected vide letter dated 19.12.97. We further note that in similar facts in OA 2660/99, the Tribunal had disposed of the application vide order dated 9.2.2000 by directing respondents 6 and 8 to consider the representations made by the applicants and intimate the result to them expeditiously.

.....3/-

YV

3. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the OA is disposed of with the following direction:-

Respondents 2 and 3 to have the matter examined with regard to the applications submitted by the applicants for consideration for appointment for the posts of Supervisor (P.Way) for which they appeared before the RRB, Ajmer, and as stated by them placed in the Select Panel in 1997. This shall be done within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order with intimation to the applicants.

No order as to costs.

(Govindan S Tampi)
Member (A)

Patwal/

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
VC(J)