

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 389 of 1992

Date of Decision: 4. 2. 1994

Versus

For the applicants M/s.A.S.Naidu,
P.K.Mohapatra,
Advocates

For the respondents 4-11 M/s.C.A.Rao,
S.K.Purohit
S.K.Bhera
P.K.Sahoo,
Advocates

For the respondents 1-3 Mr. Ashok Mishra,
Sr. Standing Counsel
(Central Government)

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

1. Whether it be referred to reporters or not ? No.
2. Whether it be circulated to all the Benches of the Central Administrative Tribunals or not ? No.

VICE-CHAIRMAN

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

No.

the No.

04 FEB 94

92

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH CUTTACK

Original Application No. 389 of 1992

Date of Decision: 4.2.94

B.K.Rout & Others

Applicant(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondent(s)

For the applicants

M/s.A.S.Naidu,
P.K.Mohapatra,
Advocates

For the respondents 4-11

M/s.C.A.Rao,
S.K.Purohit
S.K.Behera
P.K.Sahoo,
Advocates

For the respondents 1-3

Mr.Ashok Mishra
Sr.Standing Counsel
(Central Government)

C O R A M:

THE HONOURABLE MR.K.P. ACHARYA, VICE - CHAIRMAN
AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN)

JUDGMENT

MR.H.RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN): We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the Senior Standing Counsel, Mr.Ashok Mishra, in extenso in this case. The circumstances, claims and facts submitted in the application as well as in the counter-affidavit are exactly identical to those figuring in O.A.No.390/92. The directions contained in O.A.No.390/92 apply in full-force to this case.

2. We, therefore, order that directions contained in our judgment dated 10.12.1993 in O.A.No.390/92 be complied with in all respects in respect of the present petitioners as well. The case is thus disposed of. No costs.

By *[Signature]*
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Central Administrative Tribunal
Cuttack Bench Cuttack
dated the 1994/B.K.Sahoo

MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

[Signature]
04 FEB 94