

Promotion
No

6
CAT/J/12

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH
~~NEW DELHI~~

O.A. No. 543 OF 1987
~~TA No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 9.8.1991

Shri V.P. Bhaskaran & Others Petitioner

Mr. K.K. Shah Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and Others Respondent

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

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh : Administrative Member

The Hon'ble Mr. S. Santhana Krishnan : 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?

MGIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000

NW

1. V.P. Bhaskaran
2. Cicil Miranda
3. Louis S.
4. Nabibmiya N.
5. Manoharlal B.
6. Vasantlal H.
7. Laxman K.
8. Narothamlal G.

All are working as Fireman
Grade 'B' with the Western
Railway, Rajkot Division,
Rajkot.

(Advocate - Mr. K.K. Shah)

: Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through,
General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate,
Bombay - 400 020.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Kothi Compound,
Rajkot.
3. Shri Rajpati R.
4. " Jairamsingh
5. " Somprakash
6. " Jaidev G.
7. " Dorilal M.
8. " Gildev U.
9. " Gopaldas B.
10. " Vijaysingh K.
11. " Kanji A.
12. " Natwarlal M.
13. " Babu Mohan
14. " Hiralal M.
15. " Bachubha M.
16. " Vijaypalsingh
17. " Maganlal J.
18. % Brijmohan S.
19. " Kunjalsingh
20. " Gopalsingh R.
21. " Ramashre R.
22. " Khodaji D.
23. " Kanjibhai M.
24. " Noormohmad V.
25. " Suresh L.
26. " Ismail N.
27. " Prakash B.
28. " Rajdev S.

To be served through
respondent No2.

(Advocate - Mr. B.F. kyada)

: Respondents

O.A. No. 543 of 1987

ORAL - ORDER

Dated : 9.8.1991

Per : Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh : Member (A)

Mr. K.K. Shah, learned counsel for the applicants appears. This Original Application ^{as it} has filed underwent amendment.

2. There are private parties - respondents from sr. No. 3 to 28 who came to be added by way of amendment after filing the original application.


3. When the matter was listed on 25.2.1991, some ^{private parties} from the ^{parties} respondents-party-in-person appeared. They informed on that day that while they have received notice of final hearing, they have not received from the applicant or otherwise copy of the petition and the amended petition. On their such representation to the Court, ^{it} was checked and ^{the record} it was found that ^{they} did not show that the amended copy of the petition was served by the applicants on all respondents. In view of this position, final hearing could not take place on 25.2.1991 for which matter was listed on that day. The applicants were directed to serve amended copy of the application on all the respondents including private party respondents, and ^{the} that applicants were ^{also} directed to produce required number of copies of the amended petition within one week failing which application shall be liable to be dismissed. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 10.4.1991. As the order dt. 25.2.1991 was not complied with by the applicant, learned counsel for the applicants


9

-- 4 --

sought one month's time for its compliance and time was granted. Now, when the matter is listed after four months, and the office record shows that the order dt. 25.2.1991 is still not complied with.

4. In view of the above, we do not see why the private parties respondents should be further put to inconvenience because of the negligence of the applicants. ^{therefore} We hereby dismiss this application for non-compliance of the order dt. 25.2.1991. There are no orders as to costs.


(S Santhana Krishnan)
Member(J)


(M M Singh)
Member(A)

*Mogera