

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CALCUTTA BENCH

M.A. No.257 of 1996
M.A. No.258 of 1996
(O.A. 290/96)

Present: Hon'ble Dr. B.C. Sarma, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. D. Purakayastha, Judicial Member

T. K. MITRA

VS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

For the Applicant : Mr. R.N. Dutta, counsel
Mr. M.K. Bandopadhyay, counsel

For the Respondents : Mr. T.N. Bandopadhyay, counsel
Mr. S. Choudhury, counsel

Heard on 11.2.1997 : : Date of order: 11.2.1997

O R D E R

B.C. Sarma, AM

MA 257/96 was not included in today's list by mistake. As submitted by Mr. Bandopadhyay, learned counsel for the respondents, the said MA may be ^{treasured as} listed in today's list. That MA was filed for impleading three persons who are junior to the applicant and who have been given promotion superseding his claim. Mr. Bandopadhyay does not have any objection to the allowing of the MA. Accordingly the MA is allowed and necessary correction in the OA may be made as per rules.

2./ We find that an interim order was passed already on 12.4.96. Although it has been submitted by Mr. Dutta, learned counsel in this case for the applicant to the effect that on the date of passing of the interim order, four persons, who have been impleaded in this MA, were not given promotion, we have noted that these four persons have now been impleaded in this case. As a result, the interim order passed earlier will operate against those persons and

Contd...2/-

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CALCUTTA BENCH

M.A. No.257 of 1996
M.A. No.258 of 1996
(O.A. 290/96)

Present: Hon'ble Dr. B.C. Sarma, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. D. Purakayastha, Judicial Member

T. K. MITRA

VS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

For the Applicant : Mr. R.N. Dutta, counsel
Mr. M.K. Bandopadhyay, counsel

For the Respondents : Mr. T.N. Bandopadhyay, counsel

Heard on 11.2.1997 : : Date of order: 11.2.1997

O R D E R

B.C. Sarma, AM

MA 257/96 was not included in today's list by mistake. As submitted by Mr. Bandopadhyay, learned counsel for the respondents, the said MA may be listed in today's list. That MA was filed for impleading three persons who are junior to the applicant and who have been given promotion superseding his claim. Mr. Bandopadhyay does not have any objection to the allowing of the MA. Accordingly the MA is allowed and necessary correction in the OA may be made as per rules.

2./ We find that an interim order was passed already on 22.12.96. Although it has been submitted by Mr. Dutta, learned counsel in this case for the applicant to the effect that on the date of passing of the interim order four persons who have been impleaded in this MA were not given promotion, we have noted that these four persons have now been impleaded in this case. As a result, the interim order passed earlier will operate against those persons and