

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
AHMEDABAD BENCH, AHMEDABAD

RA/M.A/O.A./T.A./ 432 1989

Hamun Union of India Applicant (s).

B.R. Kyada Adv. for the  
Petitioner (s).

Hamun Union of India Versus  
Respondent (s).



B.B. Gogia Adv. for the  
Respondent (s).

SR. NO.	DATE.	ORDERS.
		slg & opening Award (Copy & Send)
	06/11	RPAO Recd from Resp.
	5/12/89	Mr. B.R. Kyada not present. Mr. B.B. Gogia has filed sick note. Adjourned. The case be posted for admission.
		<u>Pgm</u> <u>stic</u> <u>Office 6/12</u>
	18/1	Common letter filed in case no OA/422/89 letter dt 18/1/90. <u>OA</u> <u>18/1</u>
		<u>Resp.</u> RPAO Recd from Applicant kept in OA/427/89 (21/02)
	2/3	Parties absent. no documents produced. Adjourned on same stage to 6/6/90.
	6/6	Parties absent. no documents produced Adjourned on same stage to 19/4/90. <u>CL</u> <u>19/4</u> <u>CL</u>

SR NO.	DATE.	ORDERS.
	<p>1990</p> <p>19/6</p> <p>22/09/92 FIH</p> <p>208342</p> <p>208349</p> <p>1286</p> <p>28/09/92</p>	<p>Today case is on Board before Registrar. No documents produced. Enough acknowledgments given earlier. It is a fit case to close the right to file reply. Submitted for orders before Hon'ble Members.</p> <p>ch</p> <p>7/9/92</p> <p>Date informed to both advocate's Clerks</p>

OA 1432/91

(2)

Date	Office Report	O R D E R
22-09-1992		<p data-bbox="863 515 1560 697">Court was adjourned as a mark of respect to late Ex-Chief Justice of India Shri M. Hidayatullah of India.</p> <p data-bbox="871 765 1316 817">Call on 3 /11 /1992.</p> <div data-bbox="871 843 1568 1010"><div> (R.C. Bhatt) Member (J)</div><div> (N.V. Krishnan) Vice Chairman</div></div> <p data-bbox="879 1104 959 1140">*AS.</p>

DATE OFFICE REPORT

ORDER

18.10.93

This matter is disposed of by  
common judgment in O.A. 422/89 & Ors.

*M.R. Kolhatkar*

(M.R. Kolhatkar)  
Member (A)

*R.C. Bhatt*

(R.C. Bhatt)  
Member (J)

vtc.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

AHMEDABAD BENCH

AHMEDABAD

Application No. 04/1032/89 of 199

Transfer Application No. \_\_\_\_\_ Old Writ Pet. NO. \_\_\_\_\_

C E R T I F I C A T E

Certified that no further action is required to be taken  
and the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided).

Dated : 17/12/93

Countersigned :

*Ahmed*  
*27-12-93*  
Section Officer/Court Officer

*ccccc*  
Sign. of the Dealing Assistant.

CAUSE TITLE.....OF 198 ☐ .

U. O. I.

## VERSUS

MR. HARRY JASON

**PART A B & C**

[illegible]

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
AHMEDABAD BENCH

Submitted;

C.A.T./Judicial Section.

Original Petition No.: 432 of 89.

Miscellaneous Petition No.:        of       .

Shri Union of India Petitioner(s).  
Versus.

Hann Jural Respondent(s).

This application has been submitted to the Tribunal by Shri G.R. Krida under Section 19 of The Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985. It has been scrutinised with reference to the points mentioned in the check list in the light of the provisions contained in the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and Central Administrative Tribunals (Procedure) Rules, 1985.

The application has been found in order and may be given to concerned for fixation of date.

The application is not been found in order for the same reasons indicated in the check list. The applicant may be advised to rectify the same within 21 days/Draft letter is placed below for signature.

✓ Applicant / Verifier is not signed Adv & Applicant

✓ One more copy

8  
21/9  
JMS  
11/9

We

Has issued a common  
obj. letter in off file no 402/89

11/9/89

11/9/89

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALAHMEDABAD BENCHAPPLICANT (S) Union of IndiaRESPONDENTS (S) Harnam JindalPARTICULARS TO BE EXAMINEDENDORSEMENT AS TO  
RESULT OF EXAMINATION

1. Is the application competent?
2. (A) Is the application in the prescribed form?
- (B) Is the application in paper book form?
- (C) Have prescribed number complete sets of the application been filed?
3. Is the application in time?  
If not, by how many days is it beyond time?  
Has sufficient cause for not making the application in time stated?
4. Has the document of authorisation/ Vakalet name been filed?
5. Is the application accompanied by B.D./I.P.O for Rs.50/-? Number of B.D./I.P.O. to be recorded.
6. Has the copy/copies of the order(s) against which the application is made, been filed?
7. (a) Have the copies of the documents relied upon by the applicant and mentioned in the application been filed?
- (b) Have the documents referred to in (a) above duly attested and numbered accordingly?
- (c) Are the documents referred to in (a) above neatly typed in double space?
8. Has the index of documents has been filed and has the paging been done properly?

Y

Y

Y

Y

Y

—

Y

11  
6

41320

Y (Annex A-P11)

Y

Y

Y

Y



PARTICULARS TO BE EXAMINED

ENDORSEMENT AS TO BE  
RESULT OF EXAMINATION.

9. Have the chronological details of representations made and the outcome of such representation been indicated in the application?
10. Is the matter raised in the application pending before any court of law or any other Bench of the Tribunal?
11. Are the application/duplicate copy/spare copies signed?
12. Are extra copies of the application with annexures filed.
  - (a) Identical with the original.
  - (b) Defective.
  - (c) Wanting in Annexures  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Page Nos \_\_\_\_\_?
  - (d) Distinctly Typed?
13. Have full size envelopes bearing full address of the Respondents been filed?
14. Are the given addressed, the registered addressed?
15. Do the names of the parties stated in the copies, tally with those indicated in the application?
16. Are the translations certified to be true or supported by an affidavit affirming that they are true?
17. Are the facts for the cases mentioned under item No.6 of the application.
  - (a) Concise?
  - (b) Under Distinct heads?
  - (c) Numbered consecutively?
  - (d) Typed in double space on one side of the paper?
18. Have the particulars for interim order prayed for, stated with reasons?

Y

MP

Y

MP

Y

Y

Y

Y

checked  
Y  
11/5