

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH
~~NEW DELHI~~

O.A. No. 477 OF 1990 ~~1988~~
~~Ex No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 27-3-1991

Yusuf Abdulsattar Ranger, Petitioner

Petitioner-in-person Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Chief General Manager Telecom, Respondent
Ahmedabad.

Mr. P.M. Raval. Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh, Administrative Member.

The Hon'ble Mr. S. Santhana Krishnan, Judicial Member.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? No
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? No
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? No
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? No

Yusuf Abdulsattar Ranger
Telecom Office Assistant,
C/o Telecom District Engineer,
Bhuj - 370 001.

..... Applicant.

(Petitioner-in-person)

Versus.

Chief General Manager Telecom,
Gujarat Telecommunication Circle,
Ahmedabad - 380 009.

..... Respondents.

(Advocate: Mr. P.M. Raval)

ORAL ORDER

O.A.No.477/90

Date: 27-3-1991.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh, Administrative Member.

Vakalatnama which counsel Mr. S.K. Bukari said on 7.3.1991 he would file in the Registry has not been filed. Mr. Bukari had sought adjournment on 7.3.91 to file Vakalatnama. Notice dated 20th March, 1991 issued on applicant Mr. Yusuf A. Ranger presumed served. Applicant also not present. None present for the respondents.

2. This Original Application was filed by the applicant to pray for relief of his transfer from Bhuj to Godhra or nearer Godhra to places Baroda, Nadiad or Anand. In para-3 of the application the order under challenge is dated 21.3.1986 passed by Telecom District Engineer Godhra division, Godhra. The application^{was} filed on 8.10.1990. ^{and is} ~~We see~~ therefore obviously barred by time in view of provisions under section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. However, despite this obvious position the applicant had made a declaration that he has filed the application within the limitation prescribed under section 21

(6)

of the Act.

3. Apart from the above, the grounds canvassed for relief are that the applicant was under suspension and when the order of suspension was revoked he was transferred to the jurisdiction of Director, Telecom, Rajkot under whom his services were placed. The applicant came to be acquitted in the case the C.B.I. had registered against him. After his such acquittal he has been making efforts for his transfer from his present place of posting at Bhuj on grounds of compassionate family circumstances. ^{of} ~~the applicant.~~

4. While the administration is free to consider such request, it is not for Tribunal to issue any direction to respondents that he should be transferred in accordance with his request or representation.

5. In view of the above the application has no merits for consideration. The same is rejected with no order as to costs.


(S. Santhana Krishnan)
Judicial Member

M H. Sur.
(M.M. Singh)
Admn. Member

etc.