

11.8.95Hon. Dr. R.K. Saxena, J.M.

(8) Sri R.C. Sinha learned counsel for the applicant is present. These two O.A's relating to the order of compulsory retirement of the applicant. Sri Sinha pointed out that O.A. No. 1546/93 was filed against the order of compulsory retirement was passed on 9.7.93 but subsequently the stay was withdrawn by the respondents and the fresh order of compulsory retirement was passed on 20.9.93 and, therefore, O.A. no. 315/94 was filed. Sri Sinha should argue on the next date as to why the O.A. no. 1546/95 does not become infreectious. Fix on 28.08.95.

J.M.

/pc/

OR

File Submitted before Hon'ble  
Coul - on 28.8.95 for  
admission along with OA.  
315 of 94.

28-8-95

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, V.C.  
Hon'ble Mr. S. Das Gupta, A.M.

28-8-95

We have heard the Learned Counsel for the Applicant in O.A. No.1546/93. Through this O.A. the Applicant has challenged the order of compulsory retirement passed on 9-7-93 and thereafter a fresh order for compulsory retirement was passed on 20-9-93 against which O.A. No.315/94 has been filed. The order for compulsory retirement that would be extant would be the order passed on 20-9-93. In view of this order, O.A. No.1546/93 is rendered infructuous. This O.A. is dismissed accordingly.

RBD/

A.M.

V.C.