0 A. 256/95

) ,

(P)

Seria. No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature	Office note as to action (if any) taken on order
V		10.0RDER DATED 4-10-2001.	
		Leamed counsel for the	Ndj. to
		Applicant and his Associates are absent.	on the act bro
		similarly learned counsel for private	\$ 00 Person 4
		Respondent No. 5, Shri A. Deo and his	12/ 6e, a oega
		associates are also absent. There is no	Mo Ashor
		request for adjournment from both sides.	and some hos
		As in this Case pleadings have been	chos sacold pas
		completed long ago, it is not possible	R-1 80 K-11.
		to drag on the matter indefinitely more	5-8- por 20
	-	so in the absence of any request for	obbeneauco.
		adjournment. We have, therefore, heard	MA 442 95
		Shri A.K.Bose, learned Senior Standing	pos extrostos
		Counsel appearing for the Departmental	et gare go
8		Respondents, and have also perused the	
-		records.	copy of
z		in this Original Application	DW 4- 1942   95- 80)
		the Applicant has prayed for quashing	greneg.
		the order of termination dated 27. 3.95	BUTO
		at Annexure-6 removing the applicant	99/1
		from the post of EDDA Cum EDMC Lenda	13 row
		BO and inducting Shri Dharanidhar Das,	. S 0000K
		Respondent No.5 to that post. Applicant	coastes
		has stated that he was selected for	has been filed
g	Jan	the post of EDDA cum EDMC on 27.4.91	copy of cente
		and joined the post on 29.4.91. This	sof sound.
		appointment was made after the new	cor pregues
		Branch post Office was opened. In the	Entre
		regular selection for the post, the	73717

Serial No. of Order

Date of Order

## Order with Signature

Office note as to action (if any) taken on order

applicant applied and was duly selected. He continued in that post till 8.7.91 after which Respondent No. 5 was appointed from 9.7.1991 and continued upto 12.2.92. Again on 13.2.92 provisional appointment was made in favour of applicant. Finally on 17.3.92 the applicant was appointed post and continued. While he was continuing as such on 29.3.1995 his engagement was terminated in pursuance of the order of Tribunal dated 12.12.94 in O.A.No. 65/92 and Respondent No.5 was inducted to that post. In the context of the above, the applicant has come up in this Original Application with the prayer referred to earlier.

Respondents have filed counte opposing the prayer of applicant. No rejoinder has beenfiled. For the present purpose it is not necessary to go into too many facts of this case. We have called for the records of OA No.65/92 and perused the same. We find that in OA No.65/92, the applicant who is present Nespondent No. 5 before us and the Tribunal directed in order dt.12.12.94 to reinstate the applicant to the post of EDDA cum EDMC. It appears that accordingly Respondent No. 5 was reinstated in that post and applicant service has been terminated. As termination

country copy be served by one week None Present.

counter copy g secred

gregt or orgoes.

order at 4.8.90

served within one Week.

6 of 200000 T gree ap es aeg ens

Serial No of Date of Order Order

Order with Signature

of service of applicant by reinduction of Respondent No. 5 was done in pursuance of the order of this Tribunal, we find no merit in the prayer of the applicant which is accordingly rejected.

In view of the above, the

rejected. No costs. 0.A. is

4. (G. NARASIMHAM) MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

KNM/CM.

counter by has not too burdher

Bour