

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

6

O.A. No.

608

OF 1988

~~T.A. No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 24-04-1992.

Shri Manga Gobriya and ors. Petitioner

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

Versus

Union of India and Ors. Respondent

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

CORAM :

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

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 ? ✗

- (2)
1. Shri Manga Gobriya,
 2. Shri Somji Galu,
 3. Shri Vala Bhura,
 4. Shri Harishanker Jangi
 5. Sagelu Anoop
 6. Jitra Seetu
 7. Titiya paidiya
 8. Smt. Bijali Pooniya,
 9. Smt. Hakri Kamji,
 10. Smt. Meta Badiya,
 11. Smt. Lalita Ratansingh,
 12. Shri Ramsing Somji , and
 13. Shri Dala Guman.

...Applicants.

All C/o. Harishanker Jangi,
Sant Kabir Nagar, Akota,
Nr. Railway Line,
BARODA.

(Advocate : Mr.K.K.Shah)

Versus

1. Union of India
(Notice to be served through
Secretary, Ministry of Railway,
South Block,
New Delhi.
2. General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate,
Bombay.
3. Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Pratapnagar,
Baroda.
4. Sr.Divl. Railway Engineer-I,
Western Railway,
Baroda.
5. CPWI,
Western Railway,
Baroda.

...Respondents.

(Advocate : Mr.N.S.Shevde)

ORAL JUDGMENT

O.A. NO. 608 OF 1988.

Date : 24.04.1992

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

The applicants have filed this application
under Section-19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act,
1985, seeking the relief that the order dated

...3...

8

20th September, 1988, at Annexure-A/1, passed by the CPWI, WR, Baroda, be quashed as it is illegal and contrary to Rule-2501, of the Railway Establishment Manual. The respondents have filed reply resisting the application. It is not indispute that the interim relief as prayed for in para-8 of the application to stay the said order Annexure-A/1, was granted and is, contined. Therefore, the applicants have not been shifted to the other Station as per Annexure-A/1. Learned advocate Mr.N.S.Shevde, submitted that this was an order dated 20th September, 1988, and the interim relief was continued. The respondents have no intention to implement that order any more against the applicants and this order has almost become infructuous, in view of the statement made by the learned advocate Mr.N.S. Shevde, for the respondents. The learned advocate for the applicants submits that the application be disposed of accordingly. Hence the following order :

ORDER

The application is disposed of as the respondents do not want to implement the impugned order, Annexure-A/1, dated 20th September, 1988, against the applicants and therefore, the order has become infructuous. No order as to costs.

R.C. Bhatt
(R.C.Bhatt)
Member(J)