

Removed

B/

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIAUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 298/92
~~XXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 24.7.1992.

Govindbhai Bachubhai Rathod, **Petitioner**

Mr. P.F. Makwana, **Advocate for the Petitioner(s)**

Versus

Union of India & Ors. **Respondent s**

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C.Bhatt, Judicial 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 ?

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No.
T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION

Plaintiff(s) _____

Advocate for the Plaintiff(s) _____

Defence

Respondent(s) _____

Advocate for the Respondent(s) _____

COURT :

The Honourable Mr.

The Honourable Mr.

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 Friends wish to see the first copy of the Judgment?
4. Whether it needs to be circumstances to other Degrees of the Trial Bench?

Govindbhai Bachubhai Rathod,
C/o. Devendra B. Gharanjea,
Samratnagar Society,
Room No. 694, Sardarnagar,
Ahmedabad.

..... Applicant.

(Advocate: Mr. P.F. Makwana)

Versus.

1) Union of India,
(Notice to be served through
The General Manager, Western
Railway, Churchgate, Bombay).

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Bhavnagar Division,
Western Railway,
Bhavnagar.

..... Respondents.

ORAL ORDER

O.A.No. 298/92

Date: 24-7-1992.

Per: Hon'ble Mr. N.V.Krishnan, Vice Chairman.

Heard. By the Annexure A order dated 26.11.87
the disciplinary authority removed the applicant from
service due to the gravity of the charges on the basis
of which he was convicted of an offence under the
Prohibition Act.

2. The applicant states that a revision was
preferred before the Court of Additional Session Judge
Porbandar, who set aside the order of conviction and
remanded, the case to the trial Magistrate for further
disposal. By the Annexure A-3 order dated 30.4.92
the Judicial Magistrate (F.C) Porbandar while hearing
the case after remand, has acquitted him. The prayer
is that the disciplinary authority be directed to take
back the applicant in service.

3. The applicant has not exhausted the remedies in this case which lies in making a representation to the disciplinary authority and apprising him of the facts and making a request for reinstatement. In the circumstances, the learned counsel for the applicant seeks permission to withdraw this application. Permission is granted. Application is disposed of as withdrawn.

Reet
(R.C.Bhatt)
Member (J)

Var
24/7/92
(N.V.Krishnan)
Vice Chairman

vtc.