

(11) (18)

B

NO Review

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

R.A.No. 101 OF 1989

in

O.A. No. 34 OF 1989

~~XXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 9.2.1993

Aris Usamngani Malek, Petitioner

____ Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Inspecting Asstt. Commissioner Respondents
of Income Tax & Ors.

____ Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. N.V.Krishnan, Vice Chairman.

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

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 ? ✓

Aris Usmangani Malek,

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. Shri S.M. Nadkarni,
Inspecting Asst. Commissioner,
of Income Tax,
Baroda Range,
Baroda.
2. Shri S. Bhattacharya,
Commissioner of Income Tax,
Baroda.
3. The Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman

ORAL ORDER

R.A. 101 of 1989
in

O.A. No. 34/89

Date: 9.2.1993.


1. This matter has been placed before us for preliminary hearing. We notice that on 8.1.1993, when the case was taken up the applicant was not present. However, a notice was issued to him on 19.11.1992, in respect of the preliminary hearing fixed on 8.1.1983. This had been served on 21.11.1992 and yet he was not present,


..3..

73
8

: 3 :

on 8.1.1993. One more chance was given to him for appearing on 1.2.1993. The proceedings of 1.2.1993 are not before us. The matter has again been listed for hearing today. None is present. Therefore, we dismiss this review application in default.


(R.C. Bhatt)
Member (A)


9-2-93
(N.V. Krishnan)
Vice Chairman

*K