

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

OA/XX/XXX/91 No. 1562/91 19
 Dr. Pradeep Kumar Sachdeva Shri H. L. Bajaj
 APPLICANT (S) COUNSEL

VERSUS
 U.O.I.
 RESPONDENT (S) COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>12.7.1991.</p> <p>Present : Shri H. L. Bajaj, counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>At the request of the learned counsel for the applicant, no list on 16.7.1991.</p> <p><i>I. K. Rasgotra</i> (I. K. Rasgotra) Member (A)</p> <p><i>T. S. Oberoi</i> (T. S. Oberoi) Member (J)</p> <p><u>16.7.1991.</u></p> <p>Present: Shri H. L. Bajaj, counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>Heard. This application appears to be a follow up of the orders passed by us on 29.5.91 where we had observed that as the order transferring the applicant to Delhi has since been issued, no further directions are called for by this Tribunal. The applicant may seek its implementation in the normal manner. The application is disposed of.</p> <p>The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant has since made two representations. One representation is at Annexure-A-5 but is illegible. The other representation is at Annexure-A-6 and is dated 4.6.1991. Keeping in view the submissions of the learned counsel for the applicant</p>
		contd...2

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p><u>from pre-page</u></p> <p>we are still of the view that the applicant should pursue the matter for implementation of the order issued by the respondents, transferring him to Delhi vide order dated 15.4.1991 through proper channel. At the present moment the case is not mature for our interference. The application is accordingly disposed of with liberty to approach the Tribunal, if required at the appropriate stage. A copy of this order be provided to the learned counsel for the applicant.</p> <p><i>I.K. Rasgotra</i> (I.K. RASGOTRA) MEMBER(A) 16.7.91.</p> <p><i>R.P.S.</i> (RAM PAL SINGH) VICE CHAIRMAN 16.7.91.</p>