

No
Regular
Absorption

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. St. 390/92

~~T.A. No.~~

OA/459/92

DATE OF DECISION 22/10/1992

Jayrajinh P. Vaghela

Petitioner

Mr. P. H. Pathak

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India

Respondent

Mr. B. R. Kyada

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

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

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

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 ? ✓

....2.....

Jayrajinh P.Vaghela,
Near Ananta Nagar,
Ramdham Area, Kalavad Road,
Rajkot.

.....applicant

(Advocate : Mr.P.H.Pathak)

VERSUS

Union of India
Notice to be served through,
Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Kothi Compound, Rajkot.

.....respondent

(Advocate : Mr.B.R.Kyada)

O R A L O R D E R
=====

O.A.At./390/92

Date : 22/10/1992

Per : Hon'ble Mr.W.V.Krishnan
Vice Chairman.

At our request Shri B.R.Kyada,
Advocate has taken notice of the application on
behalf of the respondents and a copy of the appli-
cation has been given to him. The application is

u

...3....

admitted and in the view that are taking, we proceed to dispose of it of finally, without waiting for a formal reply from the respondents.

2. The application is for regularisation as a class IV employee, on the ground that a number of his juniors have already been regularised as mentioned in para 6.3. of the application. The applicant states he was screened on 28/12/1987.

3. His case was forwarded to the Divisional Railway Manager, (E) Rajkot, (Annexure A/1) on 29/03/1988, A further reference ~~x~~ has also been made on 28/05/1988 Annexure A/2. No reply has been received. Therefore, the applicant sent another reminder on 16/05/1992 Annexure A.

4. As no reply has been received, this application has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to regularise the applicant and grant him consequential benefits.

5. At the time hearing on admission, the learned counsel for the applicant submitted ~~submitted~~ that the applicant would be satisfied if this application is disposed of with directions to the respondents to consider the pending representation in the light of the averments made in the present application. The learned counsel for the respondents ~~did~~ not object to this suggestion.


6. In the circumstances, we dispose of this application, with a direction to the respondent (i.e. DRM (E) Rajkot) to consider the representation of the applicant forwarded to him by Annexure A/1 memorandum as ~~well~~ well as


10

his subsequent representation dated 16/05/1992, in the light of the averments made in this application, which should be treated as a representation, and take a proper decision in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order and intimate the applicant.

7. The application is disposed of as above.

8. A copy of the application should be sent to the respondents by the Registry along with a copy of this order.


(R.C.BHATT)
MEMBER (J)


(N.V.KRISHNAN)
VICE CHAIRMAN

*SS