

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 Counsel for the respondents states that both the O.As
has 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 ~~examined~~ in their
counter affidavit. By the O.As 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 had 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.