

0

CAT/J/12

Excerpts (No.)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH
~~XXXXXX~~

O.A. No. 189 OF 1991
Ex-AxxNo.

DATE OF DECISION 13.6.1991

Shri J.Kishorchandra Jani Petitioner

Shri Jagdish Yadav, Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and Others. Respondent

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

CORAM :

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

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

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

Shri Jairaj Kishorchandra Jani,
Jani Falia,
Halvad, Navlakha Naka,
Taluka Malvad,
District: Surendranagar.

.... Applicant.

Versus.

1. Union of India,
(Notice to be served through
the Secretary),
Telecom Department,
Sanchar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. Assistant Engineer(Group) (Phones),
Halvad.
3. Telecom District Engineer(Surendranagar),
Surendranagar.
4. Chief General Manager,
Department of Telecommunication,
Ashram Road,
Ahmedabad - 380 009.

ORAL ORDER

O.A.No. 189 OF 1991

Date : 13.6.1991.

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

Heard Mr.Jagdish Yadav and Mr.M.R. Raval for
Mr. P.M. Raval, learned counsel for the applicant and
the respondents.

2. Under the heading 'order under challenge' it is
stated that the applicant is challenging the action of
the respondents of not giving him two increments despite
of order of Union of India, respondent No.1, to give
such increments to persons who have the requisite
qualifications. No such letter or instructions of the
Government of India is annexed with the application.
The same is not shown to us during the arguments also.

3. Under the head of limitation, the application
says that his representations dated 13.5.1990 and

M. M. J.

and 12.6.1990, are annexed. No such representations are found to be annexed.

4. Papers annexed consist of a representation dated 1.6.1990 made by the applicant to respondent No. 4, C.G.M.T. Department of Telecom, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad, which representation is against enforcement of efficiency bar against the applicant and order dated 6.9.1990 of the Department of Telecommunication, Surendranagar, by which some advance increments have been granted to the five persons named in it.

5. As such we find no material to support the contentions made of the application. As such the application has no merits and deserves ^{further} no consideration. We hereby reject the same summarily.

R.C.Bhatt
(R.C.Bhatt)
Judicial Member

M. M. S
(M.M. Singh)
Administrative Member

AIT