

(14)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

R.A./05/94 in

**O.A. NO.** 136/90~~**T.A. NO.**~~DATE OF DECISION 12-9-1994

Shri Prabhatsang Bhimsang Vasava      **Petitioner**

Mr. P.S. Handa      **Advocate for the Petitioner (s)**

**Versus**

Union of India & Ors.      **Respondent**

-      **Advocate for the Respondent (s)**

**CORAM**

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel

: Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. V. Radhakrishnan

: Member (A)

**JUDGMENT**

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

No.

(15)

Shri Prabhatsang Bhimsang Vasava,  
Block No.1, P & T Colony,  
Postal Training Centre, Baroda-6.

: Applicant

(Advocate: Mr.P.S.Handa)

Versus

1. Union of India,  
Through:  
Secretary, Deptt. of Posts,  
Ministry of Communication, Dak Bhavan,  
Parliament Street, New Delhi-1.
2. The Secretary,  
Postal Services Board,  
Deptt. of Posts, Ministry of  
Communication, Dak Bhavan,  
Parliament Street,  
New Delhi-1.
3. The Principal,  
Postal Training Centre,  
Harni Road, Vadodara-6.
4. The Administrative Officer,  
O/O The Postal Training Centre,  
Harni Road, Baroda-6.

: Respondents

(By Circulation)

RA/05/94 in  
OA/136/90

Date: 12.9.1994

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


: Vice Chairman


The Tribunal has taken a clear view that the applicant was not an E.D. Agent as there was no evidence to substantiate the plea of the applicant. The Tribunal has then found that, normally, the applicant would have been entitled to claim benefit of D.G.'s Circular dated 10.3.1989 produced as Annexure A-2 in the O.A. but he did not deserve to get that benefit because he had given

16

: 3 :

a false affidavit regarding his birth date and had made unsubstantiated<sup>was</sup> allegation that he<sup>was</sup> compelled to give such a false affidavit by some superiors. We find no error apparent on the face of the record to justify review of the judgment in question. We, therefore, reject the Review Application without issuing notice.

  
(V. Radhakrishnan)  
Member (A )

  
(N. B. Patel)  
Vice Chairman

aab