

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

Or. dt. 20.6.03

MA 683/02 for consideration.
Defendant to MA.
not filed.

21/7

Bench

Or. dt. 22.7.03

MA. 683/02 for consideration.
Defendant to MA.
not filed.

21/8

Bench

Or. dt. 18.8.03

Reply to objection to
MA 683/02 not filed.

MA. 683/02 for
consideration.

29/8

Bench

Or. dt. 1.9.03

for consideration of
MA 683/02.

Reply to objection to
MA. not filed.

Order dt. cl. 09.2003.

None appears for the
Applicant. Call this matter
on 29.09.2003.

*John W
Vice Chairman
Member (5)*

ORDER DATED 29-09-2003.

Heard Dr. D. B. Mishra, learned Counsel
for the Applicant and Mr. R. C. Rath, learned
Standing Counsel for the Respondents/Railways.

By filing M.A. No. 683/2001, the
Applicant has prayed for a direction to the
Respondents to implement its order dated
26.2.2002 within a stipulated period failing
which Contempt proceedings shall be initiated
against them.

Respondents by filing counter
on 2.5.2003 have disclosed that they have
complied with the order of this Tribunal
passed on 26.2.2002. They have further
disclosed that the Applicant was given a
personal hearing on 27.10.2003 and thereafter,
a reasoned order has also been issued to him
by their letter No. P/CC/1643/CA 447/01/Mech.
dated 9.7.2003. It has been disclosed in the
speaking order of the Divisional Railway
Manager (P), Khurda Road that the applicant
was not able to produce the relevant documents

26/9

Bench

O. A. No. 477 of 2001

in support of his working as substitute in the Respondents' organisation. On the other hand, the Applicant made a request for consideration of his son's appointment in the Railway in his place. The Respondents had explained to the Applicant that his request for his son's appointment was not tenable in any circumstances; since that is not permissible as per the Railway Board's instructions. In the end, the Respondents concluded that as the Applicant could not produce any documents in support of his claim for having worked as substitute and as he expressed his unwillingness to render his service, no relief could be given to him as prayed for.

In the light of the above discussions, it appears that there is no merit in this and accordingly, the MA is disposed of being devoid of any merit.

luk
Vice-Chairman (A)

YD
Member (Judl.)

Or. No. 29. 9. 03

Copies in order
prepared for
courts for
work sides.

DB
SO 7/10/03