

Termination  
(No)

①

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**AHMEDABAD BENCH**

M.A. No. 177 of 1991

IN

O.A. No. <sup>encl</sup> 415 of 1991  
~~Ex. No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 1.1.1992

Smt. Dolarben B. Trivedi Petitioner

Shri B.P. Tanna Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Shri R.R. Tripathy for Advocate for the Respondent(s)  
Shri B.B. Naik

**CORAM :**

The Hon'ble Mr. A.B. Gorthi : Member (A)

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C. Bhatt : Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? *Yes*
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*

Smt. Dolarben B. Trivedi : Applicant  
(Advocate : Shri B.P.Tanna)

VS.

Union of India & Ors : Respondents  
(Advocate : Shri R.R.Tripathy  
for Shri B.B.Naik)

O R A L - O R D E R

M.A.No. 177 of 1991

~~IN~~ and *re*

O.A.No. 415 of 1991

Date : 1.1.1992

Per : Hon'ble Shri R.C. Bhatt : Member (J)


Heard Shri D.V. Mehta for Shri B.P. Tanna, learned advocate for the applicant. This application filed by the applicant for condonation of delay in filing the original application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The termination order of the applicant was dated 28.6.1985. Thereafter a representation was made by the applicant by letter dated 12.12.1990 to the Salt Commissioner, Jaipur, with a copy to the other respondent and there is another letter also on the same subject dated 10.2.1991 from the applicant. The applicant has produced reply of the representation given by Dy. Salt Commissioner, Ahmedabad, respondent no. 2, dated 19.2.1991 which says that the respondent no. 2 had referred the matter to the appropriate authority and that their decision was awaited. Therefore it


3

is clear that the respondents have not disposed of the representation made by the applicant till today. We therefore condone the delay in filing this application specially in view of the fact that the representation of the applicant has been referred to the appropriate authority and the decision is awaited. So the miscellaneous application is allowed and the original application is held to be in time.

2. We would also like to dispose of this original application by admitting it and direct<sup>ing</sup> the respondents to dispose of the representation made by the applicant by her letter dated 12.2.1990 and 10.2.1991, which is referred to by respondent no. 2 in his letter dated 19.2.1991 to the applicant. The respondents to dispose of the representation within three months from today. The applicant if feels aggrieved by the decision of the respondent ~~on her representation~~, she would be at liberty to file original application before this Tribunal according to law. We therefore dispose of the original application accordingly with above direction to the respondents.

3. Miscellaneous Application and Original Application both are disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

  
(R.C. BHATT)  
Member (J)

  
(A.B. GORTHI)  
Member (A)

4

Smt. Dolarben B. Trivedi : Applicant  
(Advocate : Shri B.P. Tanna)

VS.

Union of India & Ors : Respondents  
(Advocate : Shri R.R. Tripathy  
for Shri B.B. Naik)

O R A L - O R D E R

M.A.No. 177 of 1991

IN

O.A.No. 415 of 1991

Date : 1.1.1992

Per : Hon'ble Shri R.C. Bhatt : Member (J)

Heard Shri D.V. Mehta for Shri B.P. Tanna, learned advocate for the applicant. This application filed by the applicant for condonation of delay in filing the original application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The termination order of the applicant was dated 28.6.1985. Thereafter a representation was made by the applicant by letter dated 12.12.1990 to the Salt Commissioner, Jaipur, with a copy to the other respondent and there is another letter also on the same subject dated 10.2.1991 from the applicant. The applicant has produced reply of the representation given by Dy. Salt Commissioner, Ahmedabad, respondent no. 2, dated 19.2.1991 which says that the respondent no. 2 had referred the matter to the appropriate authority and that their decision was awaited. Therefore it

is clear that the respondents have not disposed of the representation made by the applicant till today. We therefore condone the delay in filing this application specially in view of the fact that the representation of the applicant has been referred to the appropriate authority and the decision is awaited. So the miscellaneous application is allowed and the original application is held to be in time.

2. We would also like to dispose of this original application by admitting it and direct the respondents to dispose of the representation made by the applicant by her letter dated 12.2.1990 and 10.2.1991, which is referred to by respondent no. 2 in his letter dated 19.2.1991 to the applicant. The respondents to dispose of the representation within three months from today. The applicant if feels aggrieved by the decision of the respondent on her representation, she would be at liberty to file original application before this Tribunal according to law. We therefore dispose of the original application accordingly with above direction to the respondents.

3. Miscellaneous Application and Original Application both are disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

(R.C.BHATT)  
Member (J)

(A.B. GORTHI)  
Member (A)