

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.210/00618/2017

Dated this Friday, the 13th day of March, 2020

**CORAM: DR. BHAGWAN SAHAI, MEMBER (A)
R.N.SINGH, MEMBER (J)**

Marina Adomario Nunes, Age - 29 years,
daughter of Adomario Nunes, Occupation : Housewife,
residing at Plot No.44, Vanmali Park, Samarvani, District Silvassa,
Union Territory : Dadra and Nagar Haveli.

**Applicant
(None)**

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through the Administrator,
Union Territories of Daman & Diu and Dadra & Nagar Haveli
Secretariat Silvassa 396 230.
 2. The Superintendent of Police (Head Quarters),
Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Silvassa 396 230.
 3. Rupali Ravindra Khaire, Age : 24 years, Occupation : Service,
residing at behind Civil Court, Samarvani,
District : Silvassa 396 230.
Union Territory : Dadra and Nagar Haveli. - Respondents
- (By Advocate Shri Rishi Ashok, proxy counsel for
Shri B.K.Ashok Kumar, R-1 & R-2)**

ORAL ORDER

Per : R.N.Singh, Member (J)

None for the applicant.

Shri Rishi Ashok, learned proxy counsel for Shri B.K.Ashok
Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents No.1 and 2.

There is no representation on behalf of the respondent No.3.

2. The matter is listed for final hearing. However, it is found that
the learned counsel for the applicant appeared on 02.11.2017 when the
matter was listed for admission and after hearing him, the orders was
passed for issuance of notice. Thereafter, on 11.01.2018, learned
proxy counsel appeared for the learned counsel for the applicant.

Thereafter, on next date of hearing on 16.03.2018; there was no representation on behalf of the applicant. However, the learned counsel for the applicant appeared on 25.04.2018 and again on next date of hearing i.e. on 24.07.2018, 27.09.2018 some learned proxy counsels appeared for the applicant. Again on 13.02.2019 and 18.02.2019 some learned proxy counsel appeared for the applicant. Thereafter, on 25.03.2019, there was no representation on behalf of the applicant. On 03.06.2019, learned proxy counsel appeared for the applicant. Further, on 05.08.2019, there was no representation on behalf of the applicant. On 23.10.2019, again learned proxy counsel for the applicant appeared and sought adjournment to enable the applicant to argue the matter and the matter was adjourned to 23.01.2020. Again on 23.01.2020, none appeared on behalf of the applicant.

3. The aforesaid facts clearly indicates that the applicant has not been pursuing the matter diligently. It appears that the applicant has lost his interest in pursuing the matter.

4. Accordingly, the OA is dismissed in default as well as for non-prosecution.

(R.N. Singh)
Member (Judicial)

(Dr. Bhagwan Sahai)
Member (Administrative)

kmg*

SD
16/09/2020