

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
AHMEDABAD BENCH

Regulation
of appointments

O.A. No. 135 OF 1993.
~~TAX No.~~

DATE OF DECISION 24th March, 1993.

Shri Vasant Rao Anant Rao Hande, Petitioner

Shri P.K. Handa, Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and Ors. Respondent

Shri Akil Kureshi Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B. Patel : Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. V. Radhakrishnan : Member (A)

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 ?

1/10

Shri Vasant^Arao Anantrao Hande,
Working as Part time Plumber,
in the office of Post Master General,
Vadodara Region,
Vadodara.

...Applicant.

(Advocate : Mr.P.K.Handa)

Versus

1. Union of India
Owning & represented by
Director General
Ministry of Communications,
Deptt. of Posts,
Dak Bhavan,
Sansad Marg,
New Delhi.
2. Post Master General,
Pratapganj,
Vadodara Region,
Vadodara.
3. Director, Postal Services,
Vadodara Region,
Vadodara.

...Respondents.

(Advocate : Mr.Akil Kureshi)

ORAL JUDGMENT

O.A.NO. 135 OF 1993.

Dated : 24.03.1993.


Per : Hon'ble Mr.N.B.Patel : Vice Chairman


Heard Mr.P.K.Handa, and Mr.Akil Kureshi,
learned advocates for the applicant and the respondents.

2. The applicant states that he has already made a representation dated 10th August, 1992, to the department claiming practically the same reliefs which he claims by filing the present application. However, Mr.Akil Kureshi, states that no such representation could be traced from the office. Even otherwise, it appears that the present application is far more detailed and elaborate than the

representation dated 10.08.1992, a copy whereof is annexed with the application. Mr. Akil Kureshi, states that one more copy of the present application is furnished to him and xhe will pass it on to the department and the department will treat it as the applicant's representation and will take a decision on the said representation considering all the aspects mentioned in the application/representation and the other relevant aspects. It is stated that such a decision will be taken within two months hereof and that it will be communicated to the applicant soon afterwards. The respondents are directed to take a decision on the representation as mentioned above within a period of two months from today and communicate the decision thereon to the applicant soon thereafter. It is stated by Shri Akil Kureshi that there is likelihood of levelling of a charge of misconduct against the present applicant. If any such a charge is actually levelled against the applicant, it will be open to the respondents to terminate the employment of the applicant in accordance with law and Rules. However, if the employment of the applicant is to be terminated, except on the ground of the aforesaid alleged misconduct, such termination will not be implemented for a period of one week after the communication of the order of termination to the applicant.

3. In view of these directions, Mr.P.K.Handa, seeks permission to withdraw the application. Permission is granted. The application stands disposed of as withdrawn. No order as to costs.


(V.Radhakrishnan)
Member (A)


(N.E.Patel)
Vice Chairman

AIT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, DELHI

Application No. CA/135/93

of 19 .

Transfer application No.

Old Write Pet. No.

CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required to be taken and the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided).

Dated: 01/04/93

Countersigned.

01/04/93
Section Officer/Court Officer.

R. S. Christian
Signature of the Dealing
Assistant.

INDEX SHEET

OF 19

U. A. Hande.

VERSUS

U. of T. Long.

[illegible]