

①2

The application is not in  
prescribed form.

The applicant has not supplied  
six copies. The Advocate is informed to rectify  
the objections raised by the Registry.

As per directions of Hon'ble Member  
the Advocate has given undertaking to  
give copies on 7-7-1986. & This matter  
may be listed on 4-7-1986.

*Bhatt*  
8/7/86

- Heard the learned Advocate Mr. Y. V. Shah for the  
applicant and Mr. K. K. Shah for the respondents.  
Mr. K. K. Shah for Mr. R. P. Bhatt appearing for  
the Rly. Administration undertakes to file  
Vakalatnama on behalf of the respondents.  
Mr. Shah for the applicant apprehends that  
the applicant may be transferred by the  
authorities and <sup>the order of transfer</sup> it may be made effective, with  
the result that he may not be able to approach  
this Tribunal. Hence, for abundant caution  
he has filed application for interim orders.  
Mr. Shah for the respondents makes a statement  
before the Tribunal that he has passed certain  
instructions to the authorities and perhaps  
the authorities may not pass such orders as apprehended  
by the applicant. The applicant, however, would be  
at liberty to move the Tribunal as and when  
he is served with any such order of transfer  
and seek the necessary relief, if any. @ P.T.O.

~~Mr. Chaitan Melvankar vs. P. M. Vankar & others for Nos. 2 & 3~~  
② However, issue notice <sup>applying R. No. 1</sup> pending admissions,  
to show cause why the interim orders  
should not be passed as prayed for.

The applicant is required to rectify  
the defects as pointed out by the Registry,  
before 9<sup>th</sup> July 1988. It is stated at the  
Bar that the Respondents Nos. 2 & 3 are  
already served with the advance copy.  
Hence the question of issuing any process  
against them does not arise. However,  
notice be issued against respondent  
No. 1 returnable on 6<sup>th</sup> August, 1988 on  
condition that the learned Advocate  
rectifies all the defects.

4-7-88.

(P.M. Joshi Jr.)  
(J.M.)

(2)

D.A. No.10/86

CORAM : (1) Hon'ble P.H. Trivedi ( Vice Chairman )  
(2) Hon'ble P.M. Joshi ( Judicial Member )

Heard Mr. Y.V.Shah learned counsel for the applicant.

Learned counsel for the respondent is not present.

No notice has been issued. The learned advocate for the applicant has been heard on the question of admission.

The applicant has been recently transferred from Ahmedabad to Gandhidham. Now <sup>he</sup> the apprehension ~~that~~ <sup>is likely to be made</sup> another transfer from Gandhidham to Kota and <sup>and there may be</sup> apprehension that further

transfers. The applicant is at liberty to come to the Tribunal when <sup>ans</sup> the order of transfer <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ received, <sup>is</sup> until then he has no grievances. The application is disposed off as rejected.

6-8-86.

( P.M. JOSHI )

J.M.

( P.H. TRIVEDI )

V.C.