



FORM No. - 4

See Rule (12)

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**

CUTTACK BENCH

**ORDER SHEET**

Original Application No. 378 of 200 3  
 Applicant(s) Hina Ronta Respondent(s) Union of India  
 Advocate for Applicant(s) M/s. S. D. Das Advocate for Respondent(s) B. N. Udgata, H. S. Satpathy, D. R. Bhakta, D. R. Behera, N. Bisoi, D. R. Sundaray

**NOTES OF THE REGISTRY**

G.P.O. for Rs. 50/- B.M.  
 For consideration pl.

AD  
 24.6.03

B.N.  
 24.06.03

DR.

alim  
 24.06.03.

Defects removed.

for regn pl.

B.N.  
 25/6/03

DR.  
 alim  
 25.06.03

Registrar

**ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL**

REGISTER

11/1/2003  
 Registrar

Order dated 27.6.2003

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant. As it appears, the applicant in this application has not made out a case as to how he is prejudiced by the policy decision taken by the Respondents-Department under Annexure-2 dated 24.4.2003, especially when it is not directed ~~xx~~ against him. Besides this, the applicant has not preferred any representation before the competent authority

## NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

## ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

For Atou's son.

Bench.

for redressal of his grievances if any. In this view of the matter, we hold that this application besides being not maintainable, is devoid of merit in as much as the prayers made in the O.A. are vague, frivolous and unfounded. Accordingly, we reject this O.A. at the stage of admission itself. No costs.

VICE CHAIRMAN 27/6

MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

AD  
26/6/03

Copy of order dt. 27/6/03  
Desired for the counsel  
for both sides.

AD  
S.O. 27/6/03

W  
27/6/03