

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD.

OA/TA/MA/RA/C.A. No.

OA/325/1992

MR P.B. Shaikh

APPLICANT (S)

MR. M.S. Tejwani

COUNSEL

VERSUS

U.O.I. & others

Mr. B.R. Kya

RESPONDENT (S)

COUNSEL

| Date | Officer Report | Orders |
|------|----------------|---|
| | 14-9-92 | Memo of APP F by Mr. B.R. Kya and dt. 10/9/92 |

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| (4) 12.8.1992 | Present: Mr. M.S.Trivedi, Adv/Apt. | <p>We have heard the applicant's counsel. His grievance is against the final order Annexure A-7. He has not sought for a prayer to quash the Anh.A-7 with a specific terms. He directed to amend the application suitably within two weeks. Obviously there is a delay if so advise, he may also prefer an application for condonation of delay. Call on 31st August, 1992.</p> |
| | (R.C.Bhatt) Member(J) | (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman |
| | vtc. | |
| (5) 31.8.92 | Present: Mr. M.S.Trivedi, Adv/Apt. | <p>M.A. 239/92 is filed by the applicant for amendment of the application, as the application on admission stage. M.A. is allowed. The learned counsel for the applicant is directed to carry the amendment in the Registry.</p> <p>2. The applicant is also filed M.A. 260/92 condonation of delay. There are some object. The M.A. will put up after correction on 17 September, 1992.</p> |
| | (R.C.Bhatt) Member(J) | (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman |
| | vtc. | |

O.A./325/92

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|---------------------|---------------|--|
| 10.09.1992. (07) | | <p>Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi, learned counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>Shri M.S.Trivedi, learned counsel for the applicant seeks two weeks time to clear the objections regarding M.A./240/92, for condonation of delay. Call on 24th September, 1992.</p> |
| (2) 24.9.92 | | <p>(N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman</p> <p>AIT</p> <p>Mr. M.S.Trivedi for the applicant. Mr.B.R. Kyada for the respondents. Call on 8th October, 1992</p> <p>(R.C.Bhatt) Member(J)</p> <p>(N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman</p> <p>vtc.</p> |

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| (4) 12.8.1992 | Present; Mr. M.S.Trivedi, Adv/Apt. | <p>We have heard the applicant's counsel. His grievance is against the final order Annexure A-7. He has not sought for a prayer to quash the Anh.A.7 with specific terms. He directed to amend the application suitably within two weeks. Obviously there is a delay. If so advise, he may also prefer an application for condonation of delay. Call on 31st August, 1992.</p> <p><i>Neeru</i> (R.C.Bhatt) Member (J)</p> <p><i>U</i> (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman</p> |
| (5) 31.8.92 | Present: Mr. M.S.Trivedi, Adv/Apt. | <p>vtc.</p> <p>M.A. 239/92 is filed by the applicant for amendment of the application, as the application is on admission stage. M.A. is allowed. The learned counsel for the applicant is directed to carry out the amendment in the Registry.</p> <p>2. The applicant is also filed M.A. 240/92 for condonation of delay. There are some objections. The M.A. will be put up after correction on 11th September, 1992.</p> <p><i>Neeru</i> (R.C.Bhatt) Member (J)</p> <p><i>U</i> (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman</p> |
| | | vtc. |

O.A./325/92

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 10.09.1992. | | Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi, learned counsel for (07) Interests of the applicant. |
| | Resp Submitted Objections cleared | Shri M.S.Trivedi, learned counsel for the applicant seeks two weeks time to clear the objection regarding M.A./240/92, for condonation of delay. Call on 24th September, 1992. |
| | SO | Q (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman |
| (2) 24.9.92 | AIT | Mr. M.S.Trivedi for the applicant. Mr.B.R. Kyada for the respondents. Call on 8th October, 1992. |
| | reel (R.C.Bhatt) Member(J) | K (N.V.Krishnan) Vice Chairman |

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|------------------|---------------|---|
| (8) 8/10/1992 | | <p>Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi for the applicant.</p> <p>Mr.B.R.Kyada for the respondents.</p> <p>Shri Kyada seeks 10 days time to file reply on M.A.240/92.</p> <p>Call on 22nd October,1992.</p> <p><i>R.C.Bhatt</i> <i>N.V.Krishnan</i></p> <p>(R.C.BHATT) (N.V.KRISHNAN)</p> <p>MEMBER (J) VICE CHAIRMAN</p> <p>*SS</p> <p><i>22/10/92</i></p> <p>Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi for the applicant.</p> <p>Mr.B.R.Kyada for the respondents.</p> <p>The applicant has filed M.A.240/92 seeking the condonation of delay in filing the application. The applicant was informed by Annexure A/7 order dated 13/7/1990 that his appeal is dismissed. This is the impugned order. This application should have been filed before 13/7/1991. It is filed only on 27/9/1992. Though the applicant grievance arose on 13/7/1990, it is stated in the M.A. that the delayed in filing this application, because representation of similar situated persons were also pending. That is not a proper reason to delay filing the appeal</p> |
| | | [P.T.O] |

Continued

of decay

Hence, the M.A. for condonation is rejected and
O.A. also stands rejected on this ground.

ne

(R.C.BHATT)

MEMBER (J)

Ch

(N.V.KRISHNAN)

VICE CHAIRMAN

*&SS

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

| Date | Office Report | ORDER |
|------------------|---------------|---|
| (8) 8/10/1992 | | <p>Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi for the applicant.</p> <p>Mr.B.R.Kyada for the respondents.</p> <p>Shri Kyada seeks 10 days time to file reply on M.A.240/92.</p> <p>Call on 22nd October,1992.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(R.C.BHATT) (N.V.KRISHNAN) MEMBER (J) VICE CHAIRMAN *SS</p> <p><i>22/10/92</i></p> <p>Present : Mr.M.S.Trivedi for the applicant.</p> <p>Mr.B.R.Kyada for the respondents.</p> <p>The applicant has filed M.A.240/9 seeking the condonation of delay in filing the application. The applicant was informed by Annexure A/7 order dated 13/7/1990 that his appeal is dismissed. This is the impugned order. This application should have been filed before 13/7/1991. It is filed only on 27/9/1992. Though the applicant grievance arose on 13/7/1990 it is stated in the M.S.that the delayed filing this application, because representation of similar situated persons were also pending. That is not a proper reason to delay filing the appeal</p> |
| | | (P. T. O) |