

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 2242/90
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 5-12-90

<u>Shri Gunnu Lal</u>	Petitioner Applicant
<u>None</u>	Advocate for the Petitioner(s) Applicant
Versus	
<u>Union of India & ers.</u>	Respondents
<u>Shri M.L.Varma,</u>	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K.KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K.CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER(A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? *No*

ORDER

(ORDER OF THE BENCH DELIVERED BY HON'BLE
MR. D.K.CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER(A))

Neither the applicant nor his counsel is present today. Shri M.L.Varma, the learned counsel for the respondents is present. On 12-11-1990, after hearing the learned counsel for both parties, the case was directed to be listed ^{for final hearing} on 4.12.1990. Neither the applicant nor his counsel was present on that day too. The case was again directed to be listed for today i.e. 5-12-1990. We have heard the learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents has drawn our attention to the Office Order issued on 28/29.11.1990 whereby the respondents have posted the applicant at New Delhi. The said Office Order also states that his transfer order dated 17.10.90 to BFR(Punjab) is also cancelled. It further states

that the applicant has been allowed to be retained in Delhi till 31.3.1991.

3. The grievance of the applicant pertains to his transfer from Delhi to Punjab. As the respondents have cancelled the impugned order dated 17.10.1990, this application has become infructuous. The application is, therefore, dismissed as having become infructuous.

There will be no order as to costs.


(D.K.CHAKRAVORTY)
MEMBER


(P.K.KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN