

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

O.A. No. 296
~~Ex. No.~~

1989

DATE OF DECISION 14/9/1989

SHRI D.G.PARMAR & OTHERS

Petitioner

SHRI V.M.DHOTRE

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

Respondent

N.S.SHEVDE

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. P.M. JOSHI

: JUDICIAL MEMBER

The Hon'ble Mr. M.M. SINGH

: ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? *No*

3

1. D.G.Parmar,
2. K.M.Makwana,
3. T.C.Prajapati
4. K.A.Gohil

All residing at:

C/o.Station Superintendent,
Godhra, Dist. Panchmahals.

: Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India
(Notice to be served on
General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate, Bombay.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
Pratapnagar, Baroda.
3. Senior Divisional Operations
Superintendent
Pratapnagar, Baroda.

: Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. P.M. Joshi

: Judicial Member

Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh

: Administrative Member

ORAL ORDER

Date: 14/9/1989

Per: Hon'ble Mr. P.M. Joshi

: Judicial Member

Mr.V.M.Dhotre, the learned counsel for the petitioners present. He states that he may be granted further time of one week to comply with the directions issued on 27.7.1989. We do not find any merits in the request made at this stage.

When the matter came up for admission, ^{on 27.7.1989} Mr.Dhotre was heard and after hearing, it was found that the petitioner had not joined the necessary parties who were directly affected by the relief sought and accordingly the petition was liable to be rejected and the orders, as a matter of fact, ^{were} passed to the effect that the petition is rejected. However, at the request of the learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.Dhotre, ^{he} ~~he~~ was allowed to amend the petition within a period of 10 days. It is undisputed that even after the expiry of the said period and till to-day no such amendment as ^{intended} ~~proposed~~ has been carried out and for that matter, no application has been filed till today. Accordingly, O.A./296/89 is ^{rejected.} ~~dismissed.~~

M. M. Singh
(M.M.Singh)
Administrative Member

[Signature]
(P.M.Joshi)
Judicial Member