

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. /183/92
T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 19.10.1993

A.R.Pandya & others Petitioner

Mr. I.M.Pandya Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & others Respondent

Mr.Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

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

The Hon'ble Mr. M.R.Kolhatkar : Administrative Member

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. Shri A.R.Pandya,
2. " N.V.Yagnik,
3. " B.M.Patel(sr.)
4. " N.R.Modi,
5. " H.B.Panchal,
6. " N.R.Pathan,
7. " B.M.Patel(Jr.)

All telegraph Master (OP),
Central Telegraph Office,
Bhadra,
AHMEDABAD

: APPLICANTS

Advocate : Mr. I.M.Pandya

VERSUS

1. Union of India,
copy to be served on
The Chief General Manager,
Telecom Circle,
Ashram Road,
AHMEDABAD

2. The Chief Superintendent,
Central Telegraph Office,
Bhadra,
AHMEDABAD

: RESPONDENTS

Advocate : Mr. Akil Kureshi

ORAL JUDGEMENT

O.A./183/92

Date : 19.10.93.

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

Mr. I.M.Pandya, learned advocate
for the applicants. Mr. Akil Kureshi, learned advocate for
the respondents.

2. Mr. Pandya for the applicant today
produces the order dated 03.8.1993 by the Chief Superintendent, CTO, Ahmedabad, in which there is a reference to
DOT, New Delhi letter dated 02.07.1992. He submits that
a similar order is likely to be passed in favour of the
applicant. The applicant wants to withdraw this O.A.

Mr.Kureshi, learned advocate for the respondents has no objection. Hence, withdrawal is allowed. Application is disposed of as withdrawn. No order as to costs. If the applicant has any cause of action later on in this matter, he can reagitate the matter as ~~per~~ per rules.

M.R.Kolhatkar

(M.R.KOLHATKAR)
Member (A)

Date: 19.10.93.

R.C.Bhatt

(R.C.BHATT)
Member (A)

Date: 19.10.93.

ssk

1. Shri A.R.Pandya,
2. " N.V.Yagnik,
3. " B.M.Patel(sr.)
4. " N.R.Modi,
5. " H.B.Panchal,
6. " N.R.Pathan,
7. " B.M.Patel(Jr.)

All telegraph Master (OP),
Central Telegraph Office,
Bhadra,
AHMEDABAD

: APPLICANTS

Advocate : Mr. I.M.Pandya

VERSUS

1. Union of India,
copy to be served on
The Chief General Manager,
Telecom Circle,
Ashram Road,
AHMEDABAD

2. The Chief Superintendent,
Central Telegraph Office,
Bhadra,
AHMEDABAD

: RESPONDENTS

Advocate : Mr.Akil Kureshi

ORAL JUDGEMENT

O.A./183/92

Date : 19.10.93.

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

Mr. I.M.Pandya, learned advocate
for the applicants. Mr.Akil Kureshi, learned advocate for
the respondents.

2. Mr.Pandya for the applicant today
produces the order dated 03.8.1993 by the Chief Superintendent, CTO, Ahmedabad, in which there is a reference to
DOT, New Delhi letter dated 02.07.1992. He submits that
a similar order as likely to be passed in favour of the

Mr.Kureshi, learned advocate for the respondents has no objection. Hence, withdrawal is allowed. Application is disposed of as withdrawn. No order as to costs. If the applicant has any cause of action later on in this matter, he can reagitate the matter as ~~per~~ per rules.

(M.R.KOLHATKAR)
Member (A)

Date: 19.10.93.

(R.C.BHATT)
Member (A)

Date: 19.10.93.

ssh