

18

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

**O.A.NO.** 518/90  
**T.A.NO.**

**DATE OF DECISION** 29.4.98

Pratapsingh N & ors. Petitioner

Mr.P.H.Pathak Advocate for the Petitioner [s]  
Versus

Union of India & ors. Respondent

Mr.N.S.Shevde Advocate for the Respondent [s]

**CORAM**

**The Hon'ble Mr. V.Ramakrishnan** Vice Chairman

**The Hon'ble Mr. P.C.Kannan** Member (J)

**JUDGMENT**

- 1, Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ? <sup>✓</sup>
- 2, To be referred to the Reporter or not ? <sup>✓</sup>
- 3, Whether their Lerdships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
- 4, Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? <sup>✓</sup>

19

2

1 ) Pratapsingh Navalsinh  
2 ) Association of Rly & Post Employees,  
Through Its Treasurer,  
R.C.Pathak,  
Having office at Allap Duplex,  
Opp.Anjli Cinema,  
Vasna Road,  
Ahmedabad .

....Applicants

Advocate Mr. P.H.Pathak

versus

1) Union of India, Through :  
General Manager,  
W.Rly.,Churchgate,  
Bombay.  
2) Chief Engineer(C),  
Western Railway,  
Ahmedabad.  
3) Executive Engineer(C),  
Western Railway,  
at present having office at  
Railway Station,  
Ahmedabad .

....Respondents

Advocate Mr. N.S.Shevde

ORAL ORDER

O.A. 518/90

Date: 29.4.1998

Per Hon'ble Mr.V.Ramakrishnan

Vice Chairman

Heard Mr.Pathak for the applicants and Mr.Shevde,

the Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicants have challenged the termination of their services. Mr. Shevde now files an additional reply statement stating that the Railway Administration does not propose to enforce the notice/letter dated 31.8.1989, as at Annexure A-1. He further brings out that the applicants have been absorbed as a Gangman and he also refers to para-5 of the reply statement and states that they have approached the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad challenging the action of the respondents and the said application is pending hearing and final disposal.

3. We record the statement of Mr. Shevde and note that his submission that the Railway Administration does not propose to enforce the impugned termination order, dated 31.8.89. In view of this statement made by Mr. Shevde, we formally quash the impugned order dated 31.8.89, as at Annexure A-1. We also note the submission of the Railway Administration that the applicants have approached the Industrial Tribunal regarding absorption. Mr. Pathak says that in view of these submissions, he does not press the prayer for regularisation.

4. In the context of the submissions of others, the O.A. stands disposed of as above. No order as

Dharmay  
( P.C.Kannan )  
Member (J)

Re  
(V.Ramak  
Vice C