

(5)

<sup>B</sup>  
**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 448 of 1989  
~~XXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION ~~x~~ 21st June, 1993.

Shri G.S.Patel Petitioner

Shri D.M.Thakkar Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and others Respondent

Shri Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

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

The Hon'ble Mr. V.Radhakrishnan : Member (A)

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 ?
- No

Shri G.S.Patel  
27, Jupiter Society,  
Chandlodia Road,  
Opp : Dhanjibhai's Well,  
Ahmedabad.

...Applicant.

( Advocate : Mr.D.M.Thakkar )

Versus

1. Union of India  
(Collector of Central Excise,  
Customs House,  
Ahmedabad.)
2. The Asstt. Collector of Central Excise,  
2nd Floor, Division - 6,  
Stadium House,  
Navrangpura,  
Ahmedabad.

...Respondents.

( Advocate : Mr. Akil Kureshi )

ORAL JUDGMENT

O.A.NO. 448 OF 1989.


Dated : 21st June, 1993.


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

After discussion at the Bar, the applicant is directed to make a representation to the concerned authority within a period of two weeks from today and, if the applicant makes such a representation within <sup>the</sup> stipulated period, the respondent no.2 is directed to consider and take decision on the representation within a period of four weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation by him. The respondents are directed not to effect recovery from the salary of the applicant pursuant to the impugned order till the applicant's representation is decided and for a period of two weeks after its communication to the applicant in the event of the decision <sup>on</sup> ~~to~~ the representation going against the applicant. If the applicant desires ~~the~~ personal

hearing, his request in that behalf may be considered by the respondent no.2 on its merits. The respondent no.2 is further directed to give a speaking order on the representation of the applicant if the decision on the representation is against the applicant.

2. In view of these directions, Mr.D.M.Thakkar, for the applicant, seeks permission to withdraw the application with liberty to file a fresh application <sup>by</sup> ~~for~~ the event of the applicant being dis-satisfied <sup>by</sup> ~~on~~ the decision <sup>on</sup> ~~of~~ the representation. Permission granted with liberty as asked for. Application stands disposed of as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

  
( V.Radhakrishnan )  
Member (A)

  
( N.B.Patel )  
Vice Chairman

AIT