

B

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

No Transfer

O.A. No 342/89

~~LA No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 7.1.1993

Shri Bhavanbhai Mangalbhai & Petitioner
Others four

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

Versus

The Union of India & Ors. Respondent

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

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? ✗

(9)

Shri Bhabhai Manglabhai &
Other four

.... Applicants

Vs.

1. Union of India,
Notice to be served through:
The General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate,
Bombay- 400 020.
2. Assistant Engineer, I
Western Railway,
Dahod. Respondents

O R A L J U D G M E N T

O.A. No. 342 of 1989

Date: 7.1.1993

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

1. Heard Mr. K.K. Shah, learned advocate for the applicant and Mr. N.S. Shevde, learned advocate for the respondents.
2. The five applicants ~~are~~ working as Gangman under PWI Dahod have filed this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeking the relief to quash and set-aside the impugned transfer order vide at Annexure A/6 dated 30th July,

...3...

(V)

1989, by which, the applicants were directed to report at the place mentioned therein. The applicants have challenged this order on many grounds.

3. The respondents have filed detailed reply rebutting the allegations made by the applicants in the application.

4. At the time of final hearing of this application, the respondent's learned advocate Mr. N.S. Shevde, under the instruction of Chief Law Asstt., Western Railway, Ratlam, who is present in the Court Room stated at the Bar that the respondents will not implement the impugned order at Annexure A/6 dated 30th July, 1989, till the Criminal Cases against the applicants pending at present are disposed of. Mr. K.K. Shah, learned advocate for the applicants relying on this statement made by the learned advocate Mr. Shevde, for the respondents under the instruction of the said law officer withdraws this application.

5. In view of the above facts, the application is disposed of as withdrawn. If the applicants feel aggrieved by the order of Criminal Court that may be passed in Criminal Cases against them and want to file proper application before this Tribunal in future, the bar of limitation in that case will not come in their way.

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