

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A.NO./ 245/93
EX-A-N-O.

DATE OF DECISION : 14/02/2000

Shri Gul Mohamed Mohamed Sarif Ansari Petitioner

Mr.M.S.Trivedi

Advocate for the Petitioner [s]

Versus

Union of India & ors.

Respondent

Ms.P.B.Sheth

Advocate for the Respondent [s]

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.C.Kannan : Member (J)

The Hon'ble Mr.

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 Lerdships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
- 4, Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

} ND

Ans

Shri Gul Mohamed Mohamed Sarif Ansari
TRM, Dhansura,
Dist : Himatnagar.

..... Applicant

(Advocate : Mr.M.S.Trivedi)

VERSUS

1. Union of India
through the Director,
Ministry of Telecommunication,
Sanchar Bhavan, New Delhi.

2. The Cheif General Manager,
O/o. C.G.M.,
Telecommunications,
Ahmedabad : 9.

3. Telecom District Engineer,
O/o. T.D.E., Himatnagar,
Dist : Sabarkantha.

Respondents

(Advocate : Ms.P.B.Sheth)

O R A L O R D E R

O.A./245/93

DATE : 14/02/2000

Per : Hon'ble Shri P.C.Kannan : Member (J)

Heard Mr.M.S.Trivedi, counsel for the applicant and
Ms.P.B.Sheth, counsel for the respondents.

2. The Applicant, an employee of the Respondents in the
present OA is challenging the action of respondents in not



Cont/- to page:3/..

granting his salary for one day i.e. on 10/8/90 even though he was present in the office and worked on that day and in this connection he relies on Annexures A/1, A/2 and A/4. Annexures A/1 and A/2 are representations addressed to the General Manager, Telecommunication, Ahmedabad with copies marked to all concerned. Mr. Trivedi submits that six persons who have also attended office on that day have given in writing that the applicant was also present in the office but he was wrongly marked absent. Further representation to the Vigilance Officer of the Cheif General Manager Telecommunication, Ahmedabad was also given on 9/11/90 as at Annexure A/4 and no action was taken on these representations.

3. The Respondents in their reply have stated that the applicant was absent on 10/8/90 and in token of the same, the competent authority marked him absent in the Register. It is submitted that the applicant was absent only on that day in August '90. As the applicant was absent on 10.8.90, it is contented that he is not entitled to get wages for that day.

4. We have carefully examined the pleadings. Annexure A/1 is the copy of the representation to the Cheif General Manager with a copy endorsed to SDOP : Himatnagar, TDE : Himatnagar, Area Manager, Telecommunication, Ahmedabad, etc. Subsequently reminders were also given. Certain employees also given a statement that the applicant was present on that day. The reply of the Respondents shows that no action was taken on these representations so far.

PN

Cont...page 4/

5. In the facts and circumstances, we direct the Respondent No: 2 to arrange to examine and dispose of the representations of the applicant (Annexure A/1, Annexure A/2 and Annexure A/4) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and intimate the decision taken to the applicant.

6. The OA is disposed of with the above direction. No costs.

P.C.Kannan
(P.C.Kannan)
Member (J)

nkk

FORM NO. 21
(See Rule 114)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, AHMEDABAD BENCH

OA/TA/RA/CP/MA/PT 245 of 1993

G. M. Zusari

APPLICANT (s)

VERSUS

Union of Meets 800.

RESPONDENT (s)

SR.NO.	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENTS	PAGE
1.	OA with Ann.	1 to 13
2.	Repey Serial number at - 14/2/2000	14 to 20 (4 Pages)
	'C' part	11 Pages

Certified that the file is complete in all respects.

BB 2872/2000

Signature of S.O. (J)

10/20/2015

Signature of Deal. Hand.