

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.No.441/91

New Delhi this the 28th Day of April, 1995.

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri B.K. Singh, Member (A)

Shri S.C. Dhawan,
S/o Late Shri Shanti Lal Dhawan,
R/o N-27, Vijay Vihar,
Uttam Nagar,
NEW DELHI.

..Applicant

(By Advocate : None)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA, THROUGH

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block,
New Delhi.
2. Delhi Administration, through
Chief Secretary
5, Sham Nath Marg,
Delhi-110 054.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Police Headquarters
M.S.O. Building,
I.P. Estate,
NEW DELHI-110002.
4. The Addl Commissioner of Police (Admn.)
Police Headquarters
I.P. Estate, MSO Building,
New Delhi-2
5. The Deputy Commissioner of Police (HQ-I)
Police Headquarters,
M.S.O. Building, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi-110002.
6. Shri Raghbar Dass (D-1045)
7. Shri Vas Dev (D-4)
8. Shri Tilak Raj (D-1548)
9. Shri Jagbir Singh (D-1974)
10. Shri Sabha Chand (D-1344)
11. Shri Jagan Nath (D-156)

Contd.2

12. Shri Bhagat Ram (D-164)
13. Shri Ujjagar Singh (D768)
14. Shri Jai Parkash (D1338)
15. Shri Tula Ram (D-1969)
16. Shri Rajinder Kumar (D-1345)
17. Shri Mahabir Singh (D-764)
18. Shri Satya Narain (D-1459) ... Respondents

(Inspector (Min.)
C/o The Dy Commissioner of Police (HQ-1)
Police HQ, MSO Building,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi-2)

(Dept. Representative : SI Chuni Singh)

JUDGEMENT (ORAL)

(By Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J))

Proxy Counsel Shri A. Kumar appearing on behalf of Ld Counsel Shri G.D. Gupta, for the applicant states that the litigant could not be contacted. In the order dated 27.4.95 we directed that the case be heard tomorrow and the same request was made by the Proxy counsel that the applicant could not be contacted. However, this is no ground for adjournment. It is not said that the Learned counsel is indisposed or that he is not available. The learned proxy counsel states that the litigant had not been contacted but did not say that whether he wants to pursue the matter further or he ^{due} did not want to pursue. So this is not a reasonable ground.

2. The Proxy counsel now, when the order is being dictated stated that Shri GD Gupta is busy in the High Court. This point was not taken up earlier when the case was taken up in the pre-lunch session as a mention. He only wanted adjournment

on the ground that the applicant could not be contacted. We, therefore, find no reasonable ground for adjournment.

3. We dismiss this application for non prosecution though exparte.

No costs.

B
(B.K. SINGH)
MEMBER(A)

J
(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER(J)

sss