

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
* * *

OA 475/92

18.05.92

(3)

Shri Babu Lal & Anr.

...Applicants

vs.

Union of India & Anr.

...Respondents

ORAM

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

For the Applicants ...None

For the Respondents ...Shri O.P. Kshatriya

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

ORDER (ORAL)

I have gone through the pleadings mentioned in the application. There is no order against which this application has been filed, though the learned counsel for the respondents argued the matter that the reply has been given on 5.3.1992, that since applicant No.2 in this case is a minor, the daughter of the deceased employee so a certificate of guardian was desired by the respondents to consider the representation made before them. In view of this, the application is premature. The applicant should make a representation to the respondents along with a ^{Stander} certificate of guardianship under Section 8 of Guardians and Wards Act, obtained from the competent court. The respondents

(X)

will consider the representation, so made by the applicant. If the applicant ^{are} is still aggrieved, then subject to the law of limitation, ^{they} ~~she~~ can again agitate the grievance. The reply filed by the learned counsel for the respondents is taken on record. The application is accordingly, disposed of at the admission stage itself.

James
(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)
18.5.92

AKS