

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~
A H M E D A B A D B E N C H

O.A. No. 371 OF 1987

~~XXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 12/02/1991

Shri Shanabhai Mangabhai Petitioner

Shri M.K.Paul Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Divisional Railway Manager & Respondent
Another.

Shri B.R.Kyada. Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. P.H.Trivedi : Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C.Bhatt : Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

O.A./371/87

Shri Shanabhai Mangabhai,
Hindu, Adult,
Prof. Railway Service,
Sweeper,
Railway Station,
Kanalus,
Dist. Jamnagar.

... Applicant.

(Advocate : Mr.M.K.Paul)

Versus

1. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Kothi Compound,
Rajkot.

2. The Union of India,
Owning and Representing
Western Railway,
Through the General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate,
BOMBAY - 20.

... Respondents.

(Advocate : Mr.B.R.Kyada)

Coram : Hon'ble Mr.P.H.Trivedi : Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Mr.R.C.Bhatt : Judicial Member


O R A L O R D E RDate : 12/02/1991

Per : Hon'ble Mr.P.H.Trivedi : Vice Chairman

Heard Mr.B.R.Kyada learned advocate for the respondents. Neither the petitioner nor his advocate present. The respondents state that we have relied upon a reply in O.A./225/86 and in Contempt Application relating to it in which he states that a detailed order has been passed showing how the vacancies year by year have been calculated and how they are being filled for considering the petitioner. As the petitioners in both the cases are different, the reply filed in that case is not known to the petitioners, in this case and a separate speaking order relating to the facts of this case is required to be passed and a copy thereof be given to the petitioners in this case. Directed this be

- 3 -

done within a period of four months from the date of this order. If the petitioner has any grievance thereafter relating to such a speaking order he may file a fresh petition thereon. Accordingly the case is disposed of.


(R.C.Bhatt)
Judicial Member


(P.H.Trivedi)
Vice Chairman

AIT