

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIAUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

M.A.No. 248/1993

~~and~~

O.A. No. 156/1991
~~TRAX NO.~~

DATE OF DECISION 30.6.1993

Ganpatlal Khichi & Ors. Petitioner(s)

Mr. R.A. Patel, Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent(s)

Mr. Variava for Mr. Akil Kureshi, Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C.Bhatt, Judicial Member.

The Hon'ble Mr.

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 ?

1. Ganpatlal Khichi
2. H.V. Sharma
3. Abdul Rashid
4. K.K. Joshi
5. Smt. Minakshi A. Patel
6. Chiman Chanchlani
7. Ramesh Sadashiv Gaikwad
8. B.V. Pandya
9. P.R. Bairwa
10. N.V. Khandhar
11. N.J. Solanki
12. H.D. Bhimani
13. M.P. Rathod
14. Omprakash Ojha
15. Ajaykumar Sharma
16. Lalitkumar Chittoria

..... Applicants.

(Advocate: Mr. R.A. Patel)

Versus.

1. Union of India,
represented by
The Secretary to the Govt.,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief,
Army, Headquarters,
New Delhi.
3. The Chief Engineer,
Southern Command,
Pune,
4. The Chief Engineer,
Ahmedabad Zone at
Camp-Na-Hanuman
at Ahmedabad.
5. The Commander Works Engineer
at Bhuj, Dist: Kutch
at Bhuj.
6. The C.W.E.
Makarpura Road
at Baroda, Baroda.
7. C.W.E. (P)
I.N F Line,
New Jail Road, Jamnagar.

..... Respondents.

(Advocate: Mr. Akil Kureshi)

ORAL ORDER

M.A.No. 248/1993

2 and 3

O.A.No. 156/1991

Date: 30.6.1993.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. R.C.Bhatt, Judicial Member.

(8)

Heard Mr. R.A.Patel, learned advocate for the applicants and Mr. Akil Kureshi, learned advocate for the respondents.

2. 16 applicants have filed this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, seeking the relief that the respondents be directed to ~~pay~~ pay ~~scale~~ of Rs. 425-700 to the applicants No. 16 to 31 to this application with effect from 1st November, 1983 with all consequential benefits up to the date. When this matter came up before ~~me~~ on 18th September, 1992, the order was passed after hearing the learned advocates that as many amendments are carried out in the application, the amended copies of the application be given to the learned counsel for the respondents. The applicants ~~had~~ carried out the amendment and instead of original 31 applicants this O.A was confined only for 16 applicants which were originally Sr.No. 16 to 31. Today the learned advocate for the applicants submit ~~g~~ that the applicants want to withdraw the O.A. 156/91 with a permission regarding the applicant No. 7, Ramesh Sadashiv and applicant No. 15, Ajaykumar Sharma of the ~~Seeking~~ amended O.A ~~keeping~~ liberty to file fresh O.A. Mr. Variava for Mr. Akil Kureshi for the respondents has no objection if the withdrawal is allowed accordingly.

O R D E R

The Original Application No. 156/91 is allowed to be withdrawn with a permission only to the applicants Ramesh Sadashiv Gaikwad and Ajaykumar Sharm to file fresh O.A. according to rules. The O.A. is accordingly disposed of with no order as to costs. M.A.No. 248/93 is also disposed of.

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

vtc.