

Sr. No. of Order.	Date of Order.	Order with Signature
6.	29.7.91	<p><u>M.A. 234/91 arising out of 7/91</u></p> <p>None appears for the parties. Perused the memo. Since the applicant desires liberty to file a fresh application, <del>xxxx</del> it may amount to an adjudication of the propriety of the application for withdrawal. Since the original application could <del>only</del> be disposed of by a Division Bench, it would not be possible on my part sitting singly to pass a final order. However, the applicant is at liberty to withdraw if he so likes without seeking liberty to file a fresh application for <del>same</del> relief. Put up on 30.9.91.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>M</i> Member (J)</p> <p><u>O.A. 7 of 1991 read with M.A. 234 of 1991.</u></p>
678	25.9.91	<p>In M.A.234 of 1991 the applicant prays for withdrawal of the original application i.e. O.A.7 of 1991. It was submitted by Mr.D.Sarangi, that the applicant has a very fair chance to have an order in his favour for selection to a post under the Respondents. The apprehension of the applicant is that pendency of this case is perhaps standing on his way to receive the order of appointment. Hence the prayer is to withdraw O.A.7 of 1991. Prayer stands allowed. The applicant is permitted to withdraw O.A.7 of 1991. The applicant is given liberty to approach this Tribunal with the self-same grievance in future, if so advised. This order is passed after hearing Mr.D.Sarangi and Mr.P.N.Mohapatra. Both the cases are accordingly disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>M</i> Vice-Chairman Member (A)</p>