

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A.NO. 366/91
T.AXNO.

DATE OF DECISION 26.3.98

Mr.V.D.Dave Petitioner

Mr.K.C.Bhatt Advocate for the Petitioner [s]
Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Mr.Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent [s]

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. V.Radhakrishnan : Member (A)

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

JUDGMENT

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
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 ?

Vishnuprasad Dinkarray
Dave
17, Sangam society,
Surendranagar-363001.

.... Applicant

(Advocate : Mr.K.C.Bhatt)

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through:
The Director General
Department of Posts
Ministry of Communication
NEW DELHI 110 001.

2. The Chief Postmaster General
Gujarat Circle
AHMEDABAD 380 009.

3. The Postmaster General
Rajkot Region
RAJKOT 360 001.

4. The Supdt.of Post Offices
Surendranagar Division
SURENDRANAGAR 363 001.

.... Respondents.

(Advocate : Mr.Akil Kureshi)

O R A L O R D E R

Date: 26.3.1998.

OA/366/91

Per: Hon'ble Shri V.Radhakrishnan : Member (A)

Mr.Kureshi files appearance on behalf of
the respondents in place of Mr.Jayant Patel.

Heard Mr.K.C.Bhatt and Mr.Akil Kureshi
the learned counsels for the applicant and respondents
respectively.

It appears that after interim order issued
by the Tribunal, the applicant was posted at Surendranagar
in the supervisory post at Head Post office. Keeping in view
impugned order dated 23.5.91, we have inquired from

Mr.Kureshi as to whether the order is still in force. He fairly agreed that at this point of time, the order dated 23.5.91 may no longer be operative and the applicant is at present allowed to continue in the supervisory post at Surednanagar Head Post office and at present there is no move to disturb him from that place.

In view of the above, grievance of the applicant does not survive. O.A. stands disposed of as infructuous with liberty to the applicant to recourse of legal remedy in case, of any fresh order against which he may have any grievance.

NO order as to costs.

P.C.Kannan
(P.C.Kannan)

Member (J)

V.Radhakrishnan
(V.Radhakrishnan)

Member (A)

npm