

17

CAT/J/13

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. NO. 678/88 with M.A.312/95.

~~**T.A. NO.**~~

DATE OF DECISION 1-5-1995.

Valam Sana & Ors. Petitioners

Mr. C.S. Upadhyay, Advocate for the Petitioner (s)

Versus

The Union of India & Ors. Respondents

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

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel, Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. K.Ramamoorthy, Admn. Member.

JUDGMENT

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

No

1. Valam Sana
 2. Rama Sana
 3. Sana Khoda
 4. Sukha Ranchod
 5. Bhikha Laxman
 6. Laxman Nana
 7. Ishwar Magan
 8. Ratsing Poonam
 9. Ganga Jesing
 10. Raiji Juga
 11. Rama Sakra
 12. Joita Hira
 13. Ranchod Mangal
 14. Tita Poonja
 15. Budhaji Kare
 16. Piru Rasool
 17. Gema Chatur
 18. Natear Arjun
 19. Gota Bhati
 20. Mahesh Dhura
 21. Gafoor Mangal
 22. Ishwar Budha
 23. Rama Poonam
 24. Vaja Babar
 25. Pratap Chatur
 26. Ambalal Bijal
 27. Popat Rewa
 28. Ishwar Babu
 29. Hema Sakra
 30. Jesing Arjun
 31. Kanu Bhula
 32. Mangal Babar
 33. Govind Mana
 34. Baba Budha
 35. Chandu Bechar
 36. Bachu Udesing
 37. Shela Budha
- C/o. P.W.I., Western Railway,
Nadiad.

..... Applicants.

(Advocate: Mr. C.S.Upadhyay)

Versus.

1. The Union of India, through
General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate, Bombay.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager
(Engineering/Establishment)
Baroda.
3. The Permanent Way Inspector,
Western Railway,
Nadiad.

(Advocate: Mr. N.S. Shevde)

ORAL JUDGMENT

O.A.No. 678 OF 1988

with

M.A.No. 312 OF 1995

Date: 1-5-1995.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel, Vice Chairman.

Mr. Shevde states that out of the applicants, the applicants Nos. 8 & 14 are already regularised. He further states that the applicants Nos. 2 to 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 & 16, 18 to 24, 26 to 28, 30 to 33 & 35 are screened on 21.1.1994 and that the applicants Nos. 12 & 37 are screened on 18.10.1991 and that these applicants will be regularised as and when their respective turn arrives. So far as applicant Nos. 1, 10 & 17 are concerned, Mr. Shevde states that they were called for screening but they had not remain present. It is stated that efforts will be made once again to contact and call these applicants for screening. He further states that information regarding applicants Nos. 25, 29, 34 & 36 is not received by him and that efforts will be made to screen these applicants if they are not already screened. It is stated that the decision to screen/call for screening those of the applicants who are not so far screened will be taken latest within four months.

2. In view of the aforesaid statement made by Mr. Shevde, the applicants' learned advocate Mr. Upadhyay seeks permission to withdraw the O.A.

..... 4/-

20

with liberty to the applicants to file fresh O.As if any of them are aggrieved in respect of the dates with effect from which they are regularised. Permission granted with liberty as prayed for. O.A. stands disposed of as withdrawn accordingly. No ~~order~~ as to costs.

3. M.A. 312/92 does not survive as the O.A. itself is disposed of.

[Handwritten signature]

(K.Ramamoorthy)
Member(A)

[Handwritten signature]

(N.B. Patel)
Vice Chairman

vtc.

