

(6)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

O.A.No.2233/89

New Delhi this 9th May, 1994.

CORAM:

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

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

Shri Sukhbir Singh(Khalasi)  
r/o House of Sh. Jagbir Singh,  
Opp. DTC Bus Stand, Narela,  
Delhi.

Place of employment.

Khalasi C/O CRO, Kalka Railway Station,  
Northern Railway, Distt. Ambala(Haryana)

.....Applicant.

None for the applicant.

Versus

1. Union of India,  
through the General Manager,  
Northern Railway,  
Baroda House,  
New Delhi.

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Ambala Division, Northern Railway,  
Ambala Cantt. (Haryana)

3. The Asstt. Personnel Officer,  
Divisional Office,  
Northern Railway, Ambala Cantt.  
Haryana.

4. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Delhi Division, Northern Railway,  
New Delhi.

5. The Asstt. Personnel Officer-IV,  
Divisional Office, Northern Railway,  
New Delhi.

None for the respondents. ....Respondents.

ORDER (ORAL)

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

We waited for considerable time, but none  
appeared from either side. As this is a very old case,  
we thought it proper to dispose it of on the basis

/m

7

of the materials on record.

2. The applicant has prayed that the respondents be directed to declare his appointment and continuation as Khalasi lawful and quash the impugned letter dated 23.10.89 (Annexure-A1) calling upon him to furnish certain clarification regarding his appointment. A prayer has also been made to restrain the respondents from removing him from his present post.

3. The applicant claims that he was appointed as Khalasi vide order dated 23.7.86 (Annexure-A2) upon being medically examined and found fit. He joined duties on 31.7.86. He states that he has been serving continuously and also received three increments. All of a sudden, he received the impugned letter dated 23.10.89 and alleges that upon making enquiries from the department, he was told that his services were going to be terminated against which he has approached this Tribunal.

4. The respondents have contended that the impugned letter dated 23.10.89 is only a notice seeking certain clarifications from the applicant regarding his appointment and it is open to the applicant to satisfy the authorities in this regard. It is urged that this letter by no means is a final order. From the contents of letter dated 23.10.89, it is clear that it only seeks certain clarifications from the applicant regarding his appointment. It is not a final order as such, and it is open to the applicant to satisfy the authorities in this regard.

5. Under the circumstances, no interference in the matter is called for at this stage and this application is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*  
(LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)  
Member(J)

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