

*Transcript*

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

(J)

**O.A. No. O.A./205/90**

~~TAX NO.~~

**DATE OF DECISION** 14.5.1992

Shri Nathu Sona and Other 90 **Petitioner**  
applicants.

Mr. R.K. Mishra **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.

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

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 ?

Shri Nathu Sona and Other  
90 applicants

  
... Applicants

Vs.

1. The Union of India  
Through:  
General Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Churchgate,  
Bombay.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Pratap Nagar,  
Baroda.
3. Divisional Engineer (IV)  
Pratap Nagar,  
Western Railway,  
Baroda.
4. C.P.W.I.  
Western Railway,  
Baroda.

... Respondents

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

O.A. No. 205 of 1990

Date: 14.5.92.

Per : Hon'ble Mr. R.C. Bhatt

: Member (J)

None present for the applicants. Mr. N.S. Shevde learned advocate for the respondents is present. In this matter none is present for the applicants, but learned advocate Mr. Shevde for the respondents had made statement at the Bar that the respondents do not desire to implement the impugned transfer order dated 17th April, 1990, *per* Annexure A/1 against the applicants. This matter therefore can be disposed of in absence of applicants.

(A)

2. The applicants have filed this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 praying that the impugned transfer order dated 17th April, 1990 vide Annexure A/1 by which the applicants' casual worker are sought to be transferred from Baroda (P) to C.P.W.I. Baroda Yard, Head Quarter, Chapaner being illegal be quashed. The interim relief was granted to the applicants as prayed for by them. The respondents have filed reply taking several contentions.

3. At the time of hearing, today, learned advocate Mr. N.S. Shevde for the respondents makes a statement at the Bar that the respondents will not implement the impugned order of transfer, Annexure A/1 dated 17th April, 1990 against the applicants. In view of this statement at the Bar by Mr. Shevde learned advocate for the respondents, the application will not survive as the order of transfer becomes infructuous. The application is desposed of because the respondents do not want to implement the impugned order, Annexure A/1 dated 17th April, 1990 against the applicants, and same becomes infructuous. No order as to costs. The respondents at liberty to pass fresh order as per Rules.

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