

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

Dated: Allahabad, this 10th day of November, 2000

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.R.K. Trivedi, VC
Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, AM

Original Application No. 1258 of 2000

Jagannath,
son of Sri Baiju,
r/o village Sarai Post Bhadohi
District Sant Ravi Das Nagar,
presently posted as Instructor at
Advance Training Centre,
Aura District Jaunpur.

(By Advocate Sri N.L. Srivastava) . . . Applicant.

Versus

1. Union of India, Ministry of Textile,
New Delhi through its Secretary.
2. Development Commissioner (Handicrafts),
Ministry of Textile, Government of India,
West Block No.7, R.K. Puram, New Delhi.
3. Regional Director, Centre Region,
Office of the Development Commissioner (Handicrafts),
Government of India, Ministry of Textile,
B-47 Maha Nagar Extension Lucknow UP 226006.
4. Assistant Director (Handicrafts) Office
of the Development Commissioner (Handicrafts)
Carpet Weaving Training Service Centre,
Sigera, Varanasi.
5. Deputy Accountant General Administration
Audit and Accounts Department,
Office of the Accountant General (Audit-I) U.P.
Dayanand Marg, Allahabad.
6. Maha Nideshak,
Rajgar Avam Prasikshan Maha Nideshalaya,
Labour Ministry, Government of India,
14/11, Jam Nagar, House, Sahjahan Road,
New Delhi.

. Respondents

O R D E R (Open Court)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.R.K. Trivedi, VC)

Heard counsel for the applicant. By this
application u/s 19 of Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985,
the applicant has challenged his re-deployment as Class-IV

Contd..2

employee in the office of Deputy Accountant General, General Administration, Indian Audit and Accounts Department Allahabad. It is not disputed that the applicant has been rendered surplus so far his earlier posting as Instructor in the Carpet Weaving Training Centre is concerned. From the record, it also appears that the applicant has only ^{about} six months to serve, as his date of birth is 8.8.1941 and he will attain the age of superannuation on 30th June, 2001. The Government Order provides that there will be no monetary loss to the applicant, as he will be paid the same salary in the new place of posting.

2. In the circumstances, we do not find it a fit case for intereference. The application is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.


A.M.


V.C.

Nath/