

3. 2
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

Original Application No. 407 of 1991

Date of Decision 4. 2. 1992

Ananta Kumar Panda Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondents

For the applicant M/s. Devanand Mishra,
Deepak Mishra,
R.N.Naik, A.Deo,
B.S.Tripathy &
P.Panda, Advocates

For the respondents Mr.A.K.Mishra, Standing
Counsel (Central Govt.)

....

C O R A M

HON'BLE MR. K.P.ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

HON'BLE MISS.USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

.....

1. Whether the reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? Yes
2. To be referred to reporters or not ? *Not*
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ? Yes

.....

JUDGMENT

MR .K .P .ACHARYA, VICE-CHAIRMAN, In this case we have heard Mr.R .N .Naik, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.A .K .Mishra, learned Standing Counsel. Grievance of the petitioner ~~relates to~~ non-consideration of his case for appointment to the post of E.D.B.P.M., in Dakhiradas Branch Office. Admittedly the case of the petitioner was not considered(even though he had applied) due to non-submission of income certificate. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this inadvertant mistake should be condoned. Further he submitted that the selection process has not yet been completed. Hence we direct that the matter be re-opened and the case of ~~all the candidates~~ including that of the petitioner be reconsidered, if the petitioner files his income certificate before the competent authority within three weeks from to-day, failing which the case of the petitioner shall not be considered. The competent authority would then pass necessary orders according to law selecting the suitable candidate. Thus the application is accordingly disposed of leaving the parties to bear their respective cost.

b. Sahoo
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

4.2.92.

b. Sahoo
VICE-CHAIRMAN

4.2.92.

Central Administrative Tribunal
Cuttack Bench, Cuttack
dated the 4th Februar, 92/Sahoo

