

3

3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

Original Application No. 271 of 1993

Date of decision: March 2, 1994

Niranjan Chakraborty	...	Applicant
Versus		
Union of India & Others	...	Respondents

(FOR INSTRUCTIONS)

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

  
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)  
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

02 ~~25~~ 94

MAR

8

43

4

4

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 271 OF 1993

Date of decision: 2nd March, 1994

Niranjan Chakraborty	....	Applicant
	Versus	
Union of India & Others	....	Respondents
For the Applicant	...	M/s. Pradip Mohanty, B.P. Ray, H.M. Dhal, Advocates.
For the Respondents	...	Mr. B. Pal, & Mr. O.N. Ghosh, Senior Standing Counsel (Railways)

....

CORAM:

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

....

J U D G M E N T

H. RAJENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (ADMN.): In this case, the Assistant Engineer, South Eastern Railway, Rourkela has since issued a Memo of pay fixation in respect of the applicant which, prima facie, meets most of the requirements of the case as originally prayed for by the applicant. Mr. H. M. Dhal, learned counsel for the petitioner, has, however, no firm instructions or information as to whether the provisions of Annexure R/1 have since been implemented or, if implemented, whether this fulfils all expectations of the applicant. He does not therefore, press the application further at this stage in view of the action already taken by the Respondents to re-fix the pay of the applicant. Liberty is given to the petitioner to

— 4.54.1.1 —

agitate his grievance, if any, in case he has any further grievance on this score.

2. Thus, the application is disposed of as not pressed. No costs.

.....  
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

02 ~~15~~ 94  
MAR

Central Administrative Tribunal,  
Cuttack Bench/K. Mohanty/2.3.94.