

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH ALLAHABAD

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 33 of 2003

JALIL AHMAD ..... APPLICANT  
VS  
U.O.I. & OTHERS ..... RESPONDENTS  
ALONGWITH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 272 of 2003

JALIL AHMAD ..... APPLICANT  
VS  
U.O.I. & OTHERS ..... RESPONDENTS

O.A.33/03  
with 272/03

29.04.2004

Hon'ble Mrs. Meera Chhibber, J.M.  
Hon'ble Mr. S. C. Chaube, A.M.

None for the applicant even in the revised call.  
Shri D.P. Singh, counsel for the respondents.

*here*  
*has* Counsel for the respondents states that both the O.As  
*st* have since become infructuous as applicant has already been  
given the penalty of compulsory retirement, which has been  
challenged by him in either of the O.As before the court.

Respondents counsel has filed counter affidavit on  
26.09.2003 bringing the order of compulsory retirement dated  
19.09.2003 on record. Applicant has not even bothered to file  
rejoinder to the said counter affidavit, which means he has  
accepted the averments made by the respondents ~~counsel~~ in their  
counter affidavit. By the O.As ~~a~~ filed before us applicant had  
sought quashing of the order by which appellate authority had  
directed that major punishment should be imposed by conducting  
enquiry under Rule-9 of Railway Servant Disciplinary and  
Appeal Rules 1968. By the second O.A. applicant had sought  
the promotion.

Now that applicant has already been compulsorily  
retired from service vide order dated 19.09.2003 and the same  
has not been challenged by the applicant in either of these  
O.As. Naturally both these O.As have become infructuous.  
Accordingly both the O.As are dismissed as infructuous.

Sd/-  
A.M.

Sd/-  
J.M.