

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

OA  
G.A./T.A. No 471 1986.

Shri Ramesh G. Vaghela Applicant(s)  
(Xavier M. M. - Adv.)

Versus


Union of India & An. Respondent(s)

Sr.No.	Date	Orders
1	5/1/87	For Admission.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. P.H.TRIVEDI : VICE CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. P.M.JOSHI : JUDICIAL MEMBER

5-1-1987

Learned advocate Mr.Xavier M.M.has submitted that it is construed from the action of the respondent in asking Kasiben to work in place of the applicant that the applicant's services have been terminated. But he also stated that the applicant is reported sick. From the application no order written or verbal specifically discontinuing or terminating the services of the applicant has been awarded. It is, therefore, likely that the application is based on the apprehension that the services of the applicant may not be continued. While the applicant is free to approach the Tribunal as and when specific order of discontinuing or terminating the service is passed or any action discontinuing or terminating the services of the applicant on the part of the respondent takes place, if the applicant is reporting for duty, at this stage the application cannot be admitted.

  
(P.H.TRIVEDI)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

  
(P.M.JOSHI)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER

\*TR/er