atlotment of Quester

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIAUNAL



AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 6/88

DATE OF DECISION 1 23.06.1992

J.A. Misquitta Petitioner

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

Versus

The Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Mr. N.S. Shevde and Advocate for the Respondent(s)

Mr. M.A. Kadri

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C. Bhatt

: Member (J)

The Hon'ble Mr.

- 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?



J.A. Misquitta

..... Applicant

Vs.

- Union of India, Through: General Manager, Western Railway, Churchgate, Bombay- 400 020.
- Divisional Railway Manager, Western Railway, Pratapnagar, Baroda.
- 3. Assistant Mechanical Engineer (Loco)
 Chairman, Quarter Committee,
 Area Supdt. Office,
 Western Railway, Kalupur,
 Ahmedabad.
- 4. Shri A.S. Saxena,
 Junior Driving Inspector,
 Western Railway,
 Residing at 120%, Railway Quarters,
 Maninagar,
 Ahmedabad.
- 5. Shri Amarsingh N.
 Senior Speedometer Inspector,
 Western Railway, A.
 Residing at 116%, Railway Quarters,
 Maninagar, Ahmedabad. Respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT O. A. No. 6 of 88

Date: 23.6.92

Per: Hon'ble Mr. R.C. Bhatt : Member (J)

- 1. Mr. K.K. Shah learned advocate for the applicant and Mr. N.S. Shevde learned advocate for the respondents No. 1 to 3 and Mr. M.A. Kadri learned advocate for the respondents No. 4 and 5 are present.
- 2. The learned advocate for the applicant today under instruction of his client who present in the court

m

. . 3

since applicant has his own accommoda/
withdrawsthis application, he submitted that the

Railway should follow the guideline regarding allotment
of quarter in future. The learned advocates for the
respondents have no objection about the same. However

Mr. Kadri learned advocate for the respondents No. 4

No.

No.

And 5 be at

liberty to take steps if there any grievance regarding

the same. Hence the following order is pass:

Order M

The application is disposed of as withdrawn. The respondents No. 4 and 5 if
have any grievance may take steps according
to law. No order as to costs. Application
is disposed of.

(R.C. Bhatt)

Member (J)