

(W)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. NO. 93/92

Case No.:

DATE OF DECISION 30.11.94

Shri G.M.Shukla

Petitioner

Mr.R.S.Gajjar

Advocate for the Petitioner (s)

Versus

Union of India & Anr.

Respondent

Mr.Akil Kureshi

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel : Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. K.Ramamoorthy : Member (A)

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 Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

JNo.

: 2 :

Shri G.M.Shukla
Inspector of Central Excise,
Jamnagar

..... Applicant

(Advocate : Mr.R.S.Gajjar)

Versus

1. Union of India

2. Collector of Customs, and
Central Excise,
Head Quarter Office,
RAJKOT

..... Respondents

(Advocate : Mr.Akil Kureshi)

ORAL ORDER

in

O.A.No:93/92

Date : 30.11.94

Per Hon'ble Shri N.B. Patel : Vice Chairman

The applicant and his advocate are not present,
when the matter is called out. Dismissed for default.
No order as to costs.


(K.Ramamoorthy)
Member (A)


(N.B. Patel)
Vice Chairman

p/npm

M.A.S.T. 819 in OA. 93/92

(6)

DATE	OFFICE REPORT	ORDER
16/2/99		<p>Today the case is taken on Board. The present application was filed on 12.1.99, and though the objections raised by the office were notified on 12.1.99 and the learned advocate Mr. Gajjar was called upon to remove the office objections within 21 days. But till date the learned advocate Mr. Gajjar has neither removed the objections nor has contested the same under rule 17 of C.A.T. Rules of Practice 1993. Still, however, in the interest of justice, the matter is adjourned to 3.3.99 for removing the objections.</p> <p> [A.S.SAIYED] Registrar</p>
3/3/99	<p>Mr. R. S. Gajjar has neither removed (presented) nor removed office objection. Adj. on 11/3/99</p> <p>Q 3/3/99 By Regd</p>	<p>Ssn</p>

SP/SP. AOTR/ PH8.72-A-19

DATE	OFFICE REPORT	ORDER
11/3/99		<p>Today the matter is taken on Board. The learned advocate Mr. Shevde is present. Though more</p> <p>Today the case was taken on board. Neither the applicant nor his counsel is present. Though the objections raised by the office were notified on 12.1.99 and the learned advocate Mr. Gajjar was called upon to remove the objections within 21 days but as he failed to remove the objections, the matter was adjourned from time to time but till date the learned advocate Mr. Gajjar has neither removed the objections nor has contested the same as required under rule 17 of C.A.T. Practice Rule. Hence, under sub clause 4 of rule 5 of C.A.T. Procedure Rules, the registration is declined and the matter is ordered to be placed before the hon'ble bench for further necessary orders on 6.4.99.</p> <p> [A.S.SAIYED] Registrar</p> <p>Ssn</p>

DATE	OFFICE REPORT	ORDER
6.4.99		<p>M.A.St.8/98 seeks restoration of the O.A. 93/92 which was decided on 30.11.94. This M.A. has been filed in January 1999 and has been under objection. Despite issue of notice objections have not been removed. It would seem that the applicant is not serious about the matter. Registration of M.A.St.8/99 declined.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A—</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(V.Ramakrishnan) vice Chairman</p> <p>vtc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">on 26.7.99.</p>
9/6/99	<p>on R.S.Gajjar, Adv. for the applicant has neither remained present nor has removed office objection. Hence in order to give one more chance matter is adj. on 12/6/99 for removal of office objection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S. — 9/6/99 DR/lo</p>	
12/6/99	<p>Today also on R.S. Gajjar, Adv. for the applicant has objection. has neither remained present nor has removed office objection. Hence before the Bench for orders v/o DR/lo</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S. — 12/6/99 DR/lo</p>	

30.06.99

M.A.st/267/99 seeks restoration of

O.A/93/92 decided on 30.11.94.

Despite grant of number of opportunities
office objections not removed. The
miscellaneous applicant had filed earlier

M.A.st/267/99 seeking the same relief
which was declined. Even on merits the
contentions that the applicant was not
aware of the order dated 30.11.94 till
Dec '98 cannot justify the relief sought
for as no explanation explanation
is given as to what he did in the inter-
vening period.

Registration of M.A.st/267/99
declined.

(P.C.Kannan)
Member (J)

mb

(V.Ramakrishnan)
Vice Chairman

DATE	OFFICE REPORT	ORDER
30.06.99		<p>M.A.st/267/99 seeks restoration of O.A/93/92 <i>16/9/99</i> decided on 30.11.94.</p> <p>Despite grant of number of opportunities, office objections not removed. The miscellaneous applicant had filed earlier M.A.st/267/99 seeking the same relief which was declined. Even on merits their contention that the applicant was not aware of the order dated 30.11.94 till Dec'98 is inconveniencing as no explanations is given as to what he did in the intervening period.</p> <p>Registration of M.A.st/267/99 declined.</p> <p><i>DR</i></p> <p>(P.C. Kannan) Member (J)</p> <p><i>mb</i></p> <p><i>VR</i></p> <p>(V. Ramakrishnan) Vice Chairman</p>

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

Application No. 04193192 of

Transfer Application No. _____ of

CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required to be taken and
the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided). 9

Dated : 20.01.95

Countersign :

S. 112 22671155

Section Officer

PG
20495

Amr
7.2.95

cecelap
Signature of the Dealing
Assistant