

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW

## INDEX SHEET

CAUSE TITLE O.A. 214 OF 1985

NAME OF THE PARTIES Rajendra Singh.....  
.....

Applicant

Versus

Vidya .. of .. Malia .. Respondent

Part A, B, C

Sl. No.	Description of documents	Page
1	General Index	1
2	Order Sheet	1
3	Judgment dated 25-11-88	2
4	Petition alongwith annexure, 22-11-88	15
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		

## CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required to be taken and that the case is fit for consignment to the record room (decided)

Dated 29/11/2011

Counter Signed.....

Section Officer / In charge

  
 Signature of the  
Dealing Assistant

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD (Circuit Bench )  
Lucknow

INDEX-SHEET

CAUSE TITLE Reg. OA. 214 OF 1988. (L)

Name of the Parties Rajendra Singh

Versus

Union of India and Others

Part A, B & C

S.No.	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENTS	PAGE
A1	General Index - - - -	1
A2	order sheet - - - -	1
A3	Judgement date 25/11/88	2
A4	Petition alongwith annexures dt 22/11/88	18
B1	<del>Vakalatnam</del> - (Power) - <u>(A.F.B.)</u>	1

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CIRCUIT BENCH AT LUCKNOW.

\*\*\*\*

O.A./T.A. No. 214 1988

Applicant(s)

Versus

Respondent(s)

Cr. No.	Date	Orders
	<u>25/11/88</u>	<p>Hon. D.S. Misra-Ad. Hon. G.S. Sharma-Jy</p> <p>Sri R.R. Pandey for the applicant is present and heard orders reserved</p> <p>JM</p> <p>SH</p>

(A3/1)

Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad.  
Registration O.A.No. 214 of 1988 (L)  
Rajendra Singh .... Applicant  
Vs.  
Union of India and  
others ..... Respondents.  
Hon. D.S.Misra, AM  
Hon. G.S.Sharma, JM  
( By Hon. G.S.Sharma, JM)

This petition u/s.19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act has been filed by the applicant for setting aside the order dated 12.10.1988, copy annexure 4, passed by the Divisional Railway Manager (P) Northern Railway Lucknow reverting the applicant from the officiating post of Charge-man 'B' (Fitting) to his substantive post Machinist II locally. The applicant has rushed to the Tribunal without exhausting the departmental remedy of appeal provided under the Service Rules with the allegations that the order is illegal and without jurisdiction and no grounds for his reversion ever existed and he had been discharging his duties on the promotional post satisfactorily for about 22 months. It is also alleged that legally he has not been served with the order of reversion and it has not come into operation.

2. We have heard <sup>the</sup> learned counsel for the applicant on the question of admission. The order of reversion is an appealable order. The only ground alleged by the applicant for not exhausting the departmental remedy is that he wanted to obtain an interim order to prevent his reversion which he could not have otherwise. In order to examine the worth of the applicant <sup>case</sup> for interim relief, we went through the documents furnished by the applicant as well as

1/2

the allegations made in the petition. The promotion order dated 18.5.1987, annexure 2, shows that the applicant was promoted as Chargeman 'B' (Fitting) under a purely local and tentative arrangement with the clear indication that he could be reverted without notice and this promotion will not confer on him any claim for seniority or future promotion. It was also stated that the arrangement was to be made till such time a proper incumbent was posted through positive act of selection. The contention of the applicant is that there is still a vacancy and no selection has been made in the meantime. The order, annexure 2, however, states that the arrangement could also be discontinued earlier than the positive act of selection for the post of Chargeman 'B'. The order is very clear in its terms that it was purely a tentative and local arrangement and the applicant was promoted as Chargeman 'B' without any selection or trade test. Prima-facie, he, therefore, did not acquire any right to continue on this post. We will not like to record a definite finding on this point as it may affect the case of the applicant in case he files an appeal or representation against his reversion and it will suffice to say that he has not been able to establish a prima-facie case for interim relief and as such, it does not appear to be a fit case in which the Tribunal should exercise its discretion to admit the petition without exhausting the departmental remedies by the applicant.

3. The petition is accordingly dismissed at the admission stage.

MEMBER (J)

MEMBER (A)

Dated: 25th Nov.1988  
kkb

filed today  
R  
22/4

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ADDITIONAL BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Criminal Application No. of 1988(L)

BETWEEN

Rajendra Singh

...Applicant

And

Union of India & others

...Respondents

APPLICATION UNDER SEC. 19 OF THE  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1985

For use in Tribunals Office;

.....

.....

Date of filing.....

OR

Date of receipt.....

by post.....

Registration no.....

Signature of the  
Registrar

No. 21  
21/11/88



Imp.



( R. B. Pandey  
Avv )

IN THE HON'BLE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ADDITIONAL BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Original Appln. No. of 1988 (L)

BETWEEN

Rajendra Singh

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & others

...Respondents

I N D E X

1. Memo of Application	1-12
2. Annexure No. 1	13
Copy of letter dt. 18.12.1986 through which the name of applicant was highly recommended for promotion.	
3. Annexure No. 2	14
Copy of promotion order dated 30.3/18.5.1987 promoting the petitioner on the post of Chargeeman B	
4. Annexure No. 3	15-16
Copy of Railway Board's order/letter dated 27.6.1983	
5. Annexure No. 4	17
Copy of impugned order of reversion dated 12.11.88	22-11-88
6. Bank Draft No. 32/06592 Dated 22-11-88 for Rs 50/- only.	
7. Vakalatnama	18

Place: Lucknow

Dated: 22/11/88

Raju/-

THRU: GH

(R. B. Pandey)  
Advocate

Counsel for the applicant  
618-Jawahar Bhawan, Lucknow.

(P.M. 2)

IN THE HON'BLE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ADDITIONAL BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Original Appln. No. of 1988(L)

Distt. Lucknow

BETWEEN

1. Rajendra Singh,  
aged about 48 years,  
son of Sri(Late) Ram Deo Singh,  
Resident of 73B Loco Colony,  
N.E.R., Charbagh, Lucknow.

... Applicant

AND

1. Union of India through Secretary,  
Ministry of Railway,  
Govt. of India,  
New Delhi.
2. D.R.M., N.E. Railway,  
Ashok Marg, Lucknow.
3. Senior D.M.E. Loco,  
N.E.R., Ashok Marg,  
Lucknow.

... Respondents

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 19 OF THE  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS ACT, 1985.

DETAILS OF APPLICATION:

1. PARTICULARS OF THE APPLICANT:-

(i) Name of the applicant:- (i) Sri Rajendra Singh  
(ii) Name of father :-(i) Sri Ram Deo Singh  
(iii) Designation and office in which employed :-(i) Chargeeman B Loco Shed, Charbagh, NER, Lucknow.  
(iv) Office Address :-(i) Chargeeman B Loco shed, Charbagh, NER Lucknow.  
(v) Address for service :-(i) 73, Loco Colony, NER, Charbagh, Lucknow.

*Request  
Answer  
by*

DM  
O

(2)

2. PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENTS:

(1) Name &/or Designation of the respondents;

(i) Union of India through Secretary,  
Ministry of Railway,  
Govt. of India,  
New Delhi.

(ii) D.R.M.E. Railway,  
Ashok Marg, Lucknow.

(iii) Senior D.M.E., Loco,  
D.E.R., Ashok Marg,  
Lucknow.

(2) Office Address of the respondents:- As above

(3) Address for service of all notices:- As above

3. PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER AGAINST WHICH THE APPLICATION IS MADE:-

The applicant is being made on behalf of the applicant challenging the impugned order of reversion dated 12.10.1989.

4. JURISDICTION OF THE TRIBUNAL:-

The applicant declares that being a central Govt. employee and serving under respondents 2 & 3 this application is within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble tribunal.

5. LIMITATION:-

The applicant further declares that the application is well within the limitation prescribed under section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1995.

*Received  
Arun  
S.P.A.*

PM

(3)

### 6. FACTS OF THE CASE:-

The facts of the case are given below:-

- i. That the applicant was initially entered in the service of the respondents as Khalasi in group D vide order dated 12.1.1965 and successfully rendered his performance on that post.
- ii. That by virtue of work and conduct of the petitioner resulted that in the year 1971 the petitioner was promoted in class III services and allotted Machinist trade. On that very post the humble applicant served satisfactorily which further resulted that the petitioner was upgraded with effect from 1.1.1984 in grade II.
- iii. That in the entire span of service the humble applicant rendered a very meritorious service without any inefficiency or unsuitability on his own part and with effect from 1.4.1986 he was allowed to work as Charge Man B (Material Chaser).
- iv. That subsequently the work and performance rendered by the petitioner on the post of Charge-man B the Loco Foreman, Charbagh, Lucknow wrote a letter to the respondent no. 3 saying with that on the job of material chargeman the applicant already rendered a satisfactory service and in view of the letter dated 18.12.1986 the name of the applicant was highly recommended/requested by the then Loco Foreman, for promotion on the

*Rayendra Singh*  
Anand  
*True*

Av  
5

(4)

post of Chargeman B. A copy of the letter dated 18.12.1986 is filed herewith as ANNEXURE No.1 to this application, showing the evidence that the applicant was always found suitable in view of his satisfactory work to be promoted on the post of Chargeman B.

v. . . That ultimately on 5.1.1987 the applicant was further afforded to continue on the post of Chargeman B also consequently working without any inefficiency or unsuitability on his own part.

vi. That it would very material to mention that the humble applicant vide order dated 30.3/18.5.1987 further promoted against a existing vacancy to perform the job of Chargeman B and he was allowed the pay scale of Rs 1400-2300 with effect from 5.1.1987. In view of the promotion order assigned as above it is crystal clear that the applicant was promoted against a existing vacancy according to his work and performance and it was also the condition laid down that the applicant shall not be reverted from the post till the proper incumbent is not being posted through positive selection or his officiating duty is discontinued whichever is earlier. In this regard it would be very pertinent to mention that without applying the condition laid down in the promotion order any reversion of the applicant shall be mean as illegal and punitive in nature. A copy of the promotion order dated 30.3/18.5.1987 is also annexed herewith as ANNEXURE No.2 to this application.

*Replies due by  
15th June  
S. S. S. S. S.*

vii. That the applicant has already stated that he is working on the post of chargeman B and none of the regular selection ext. has been made as yet by the appropriate authority hence any reversion order in violation of the condition laid down will amount as a punishment. So far as the concerned of the work and performance of the petitioner was always satisfactory without any unsuitability or inefficiency on his own part.

viii. That with effect from 5.1.1987 while the petitioner was allowed to work as Chargeman B by way of promotion order released and he has completed satisfactory performance of more than 22 months. While it is well settled view of law that in such situation when the incumbent is retaining and working on that very post without any inefficiency, he may be entitled automatically for regularisation on that very particular post. In this regard the railway boards letter dated 27.6.1983 makes an ample support to applicant's contention that he is entitled for regularisation on the post of chargeman B and subsequently if any reversion took place by the authorities it cannot be possible without affording the reasonable opportunity/the disciplinary proceedings. In this particular case nothing has been done according to law laid down and the applicant has been illegally thrown out from the post of chargeman B which is amounting as punishment. A copy of the railway boards letter dated 27.6.1983 is also filed herewith as EXHIBIT No.3 to this application.

*Revised  
Copy*

*Ambedkar*

*Stamp*

ix. That in view of the work and performance as already rendered by the applicant it is crystal clear that the petitioner has a legal ~~legal~~ right to hold the post of chargeman B and none of the reversion can be made without affording any reasonable opportunity or applying the departmental proceedings. It is also stated that the applicant was promoted against an existing vacancy in view of the promotion letter already filed as Annexure no. 2 to the application and the condition laid down in the promotion letter has also not been fulfilled by the respondents, hence any reversion order is ~~punitive~~ <sup>trifling</sup> and arbitrary in manner.

x. That without assigning any reason and rhyme an incompetent officer on behalf of respondent no. 2 issued an order dated 12.10.1988. Under this order the applicant has been reverted on his original post i.e. Machinist H.S. Grade II, the post carrying pay scale of Rs 1200-1800. While the petitioner has already assigned that he was promoted in the scale of Rs 1400-2300 hence this order dated 12.10.1988 is ~~punitive~~, arbitrary and nothing in the eyes of law, except the deliberate, malafide intention. A copy of the impugned order of reversion dated 12.10.1988 is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE No.4 to this application.

xi. That the impugned order of reversion as alleged in this application before this Hon'ble

tribunal the main line of attack on legal ground stands that the impugned order without any reason and rhyme does not stand in the eyes of law also violating the own mandatory provision laid down in the promotion order. The applicant had already promoted against a clear and substantive vacancy rendered his performance satisfactorily without any complaint of inefficiency or unsuitability. Thus no law permits the respondents to revert the petitioner without any legal footing, or grounds.

xii. That it is also came to the knowledge of the applicant that many posts of Chargeman B are still in existence under respondents, thus in these circumstances the reversion of the applicant without any reason and rhyme is punishment. The respondents also made no selection since last 3 years. Hence the reversion order is bad in law violating every canon of rules read with principle of natural justice.

xiii. That the order of reversion dated 12.10.88 has not implemented as yet against the petitioner and the post is still vacant in the respondent no. 2&3. Hence in all respect the impugned order of reversion is violative of principle of natural justice read with Art. 311(2) of the Constitution of India.

*Rajendra Singh*  
A. M. S.  
S. M. S.

xiv. That the matter of reversion dated 12.10.1988 is being challenged in this application in case to show urgency as such no departmental remedy ought to be necessary to be exhausted and the direct application for making relief and staying the operation is being preferred before this Hon'ble tribunal.

7. RELIEF SOUGHT:-

In view of the facts mentioned as above para's of application, the humble applicants pray for following reliefs;

(A) That this Hon'ble tribunal may be pleased to set aside the impugned order of reversion dated 12.10.1988 (Annexure No.4) to this application by declaring its null and void.

Subsequently the applicant be deemed as Chargeman B with all service benefits, attaching to the post with effect from 5.1.1987.

(B) That any other relief what ever this Hon'ble tribunal thinks fit and proper be also allowed to applicant along with cost of the case on the basis of following amongst other gr

*Alfred  
S. S. S. S.*

G R C U Y D S

- i. Because the applicant was promoted as a suitable candidate to hold the post of Chargeman B.
- ii. Because in the order of promotion it was clearly laid down that the promotion is being made against a clear and substantive vacancy.
- iii. Because no regular selection has been made by the respondents.
- iv. Because the contention laid down in the promotion order has not been fulfilled by the respondents there in.
- v. Because the work and conduct of the applicant on the post of Chargeman B was always satisfactory without any inefficiency or unsuitability.
- vi. Because there is no complaint regarding performance of the applicant as Chargeman B.
- vii. Because without fulfilling the condition reversion order is punitive bad in nature.
- viii. Because the order of reversion challenged in this application is null and void without affording any reasonable opportunity.

*Abesel  
Shinde  
Raw*

(10)

ix. Because the applicant has rendered more than 22 months and performed the job of chargeman B hence he has a legal right to hold the post.

x. Because the order of the Railway Board dated 27.6.1983 is supporting the applicant's contention in all respect.

xi. Because in all respect the impugned order is bad and puritive.

xii. Because in view of the own admission of the authorities vide annexure no.1 the work and conduct of the petitioner was always remained satisfactory.

xiii. Because the applicant was promoted after contesting all the necessary requirements and found fit throughout.

xiv. Because after performance of more than 6 months on the post of Chargeman B the applicant was assigned promotion according to law.

8. INTERIM RELIEF IF PRAYED FOR:-

Pending final decision of this application applicants seek to issue final interim order;

*Alka*  
*Asma*

That this Honble tribunal may be pleased to stay the operation of the impugned order dated 12.10.1983 reverting the petitioner from the post of chargeman B (annexed as Annexure no.4 to this

Am  
12

(11)

application) pending disposal of this application in the interest of justice.

9. DETAIL OF REMEDY EXHAUSTED:-

(i) That the impugned order of reversion dated 12.10.1988 as already stated has not been implemented till now. The same h's also not served upon the applicant till now. The impugned order of reversion is highly illegal against the condition and legal position hence in the interest of justice its operation as prayed for stay needs no remedy to be exhausted departmentally according to rule.

(ii) That the case as challenged by the applicant is in urgent nature and according to the circumstances narrated in the above paragraph of this application this Hon'ble tribunal is empowered to entertain the matter accordingly.

10. MATTER IS NOT PENDING WITH ANY OTHER COURT ETC.:-

That the applicant declares that the matter regarding the relief sought in the application is not pending before any other court of law or has been rejected by any court of law.

Amrit  
Sandeep

13  
By

(12)

11. DETAIL OF INDEX:-

Index in duplicate with details of documents be relied upon as enclosed with application.

12. LIST OF ENCLOSURES:-

Memo of application along with 4 annexures vide index as enclosed.

13. PARTICULARS OF POSTAL ORDER:-

Postal order No. ~~DP~~ S 65902 Dated 22/11/88 for Rs 50/- only.

VERIFICATION

I, Rajendra Singh, aged about 48 years son of Late Sri Ram Deo Singh, Resident of 73B Loco Colony, N.E.R., Charbagh, Lucknow do hereby verify that the contents of paras 1 to 13 of this application are true to my personal knowledge and belief and that I have no suppressed any material facts.

Place: Lucknow

Dated:

22/11/88

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

THROUGH

R. B. Pandey  
Advocate,

Counsel for the applicant.  
618-Jawahar Bhawan, Lucknow

(By  
B)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL.

ADDL. BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Original Appln. No. of 1988(L)  
BETWEEN

~~RAJENDER SINGH~~

Rajendra Singh

...Applicant

and

Union of India & others

...Respondents

Annexure No. 1

N.E. RAILWAY

No. E/Misc/CB/86/12 Dated 18.12.86

From

To

LF/CB

Sr. D.E./L&Jn

Sub:- Filling up of vacancy of Jr. Chargeman in  
Scale of 425-700 in Charbagh Shed.

This is to bring to your kind notice that we have got the sanction of six Chargeman B in scale of ₹ 425-700 in Charbagh shed whereas there are only four chargeman B on roll. Thus we are running short of two chargeman B as a consequence of promotion of Sr. Sheo Foojan as Foreman/Cb.

The job of Material Chargeman is suffering as no chargeman could be deputed on this job. being short. The chasing of material is being done by Sr. Rajendra Singh to the entire satisfaction.

In view of his good working it is requested that he may be promoted as Chargeman Material chaser on local on adhoc basis please.

Sd/- Local Foreman  
Charbagh.

Rajendra Singh

Here is true copy

Shankar

14  
~~PM~~  
15

IN THE HON'BLE CENTRAL ADMI IS "RAJIV TRIBUNA..

ADDITIONAL BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Original Appln. No. of 1988 (L)  
BETWEEN  
Rajendra Singh ... Applicant

and

Union of India and others ... Respondents

Annexure No. 2

NORTH EASTERN RLY

Office Order

Shri Rajendra Singh, H.S., Machinist CB  
Shed in scale of Rs 1200-1800 is allowed to officiate  
as Chargeman (B) (Fitting) in scale of Rs 1400-2300  
on Rs 1400/- from 5.1.87 and posted to CB Shed  
against an existing vacancy till such time a proper  
incumbent is posted through positive act of selection  
or his officiating is discontinued which ever is  
earlier.

This is purely local and tentative arrangement  
and will be reverted without notice and this  
will not confirm on him any claim for seniority  
and future promotion.

This has the approval of Sr. DME/LJN.

Sd/- for Divl. Rly. Manager  
(P) Lucknow.

No. E/210/SM/III/Ch. Man

Dated 30.3./  
18.5.1987

Copy forwarded for information and necessary action  
to:

1. Sr. L 10/LJN
2. DME/LJN
3. Loco Foreman Ch. bagh.
4. CS(bills)Koch. /LJN in office
5. Staff concerned.
6. Divl. Secy. NERU/PRG.
7. Spec. copy

Sd/- for Divl. Rly. Manager (P)  
Lucknow.

*Rajendra Singh*

Actual true copy  
*Shankar*

15

Hy  
16

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ADDL. BENCH AT LUCKNOW

Original Application No. of 1981 (L)

BETWEEN

Rajendra Singh

...Applicant

And

Union of India & others

...Opp. Parties

Annexure No. 3

Copy of Railway Board's letter No. E(NG) 1-82-II-204  
dated 27.6.1983 addressed to the General Manager  
All Indian Railways and others

Subject:- Adhoc appointments and promotions.

Instructions have been issued from the Railway Boards from time to time that adhoc appointments and promotions should be avoided and should be resorted to only with the personal approval of the Chief Personal Officer where it is considered essential. Last Instructions issued vide Advisor (Industrial Relation)'s D.O. No. E(NG) II -81-RE 1-1, dated 1.4.1981. Cases are, however, coming to Board's notice that adhoc promotions have been continued on Railways for years. Subsequently, when selections are conducted and the incumbents fail to get through in the selections, they have to face reversion. In such a situation, they resort to filing petition in the High Courts and all through positive of rules is clear that such adhoc promoted have to undergo selection, the Courts have been giving to them the benefit of instructions contained in Board's letter No. E(D&A) 65-RG 6-24 dated 9.6.1965 as clarified vide Board's instructions or 15.1.1966

Rajendra Singh  
M. Sc. M. Ed.  
S. P. A. 2

(16)

~~By  
n~~

: 2:

according to which the persons, who have officiated for more than 18 months following the DAR proceedings

2. In one of the cases, afforts were made to have the final ruling from the supreme court but the SLP was not admitted. The Ministry of Railways, therefore are left with no alternative but to reiterate that selection should be conducted regularly for adhoc promotions should be resorted to only sparingly with the approval of Chief Personal Officer. Any default in following the selection should be viewed seriously and responsibility fixed.

3. Receipt of this letter may please be acknowledge.

.....

Rajendra Singh  
Attest the copy  
S. S. S.

(17)

(17)

बन दि भेनरेबुल सेन्ट्रल एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ड्रिब्युल  
अतिरिक्त बेंच लाइनज

ओरिजिनल एप्लाकेशन नं० आफ । १९८८ ईलौ  
बिट्किं

राजेन्द्र सिंह -- वादी

और

यूनियन आफ इंडिया व अन्य -- प्रतिवादी

एक्ज़ार नं० ४

पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे

श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह, उ०कु० मरीनिस्ट/।। वेत्तमान । २००-१८००वारबाग रोड जिन्हें इस कायालय के समर्थक  
कायालिय आदेश दिनांक ३०-३/१८-५-८७ द्वारा स्थानापन्न  
रूप से चाजैमैन/बी ४५५िटिंगौ वेत्तमान । ४००-२३००  
के पद पर छदोन्नति किया गया था, को तुरंत से उनके  
मूल पद ४०कु० मरीनिस्ट/।। । २००-१८०० के पद पर  
पदावनत कर वारबाग में लैत दियाजाता है। उ०कु०  
मरीनिस्ट/।। । २००-१८०० के पद पर दर्मचारी का वेत्त  
रूपये । २६०/- निर्धारित किया जाता है।

यह प्रमाणार्थ के अनुमोदन से जारी कियाजाता है।

६०/- कृते मण्डल रेल प्रबंधकौ का  
संघर्ष ६/२१०/एस.एम.।।।/चाजैमैन दिनांक । २-१०-८८  
लाइनज

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ एवं आवरक कार्यवाही हेतु

उत्तरारित:-

- १- प्रमलेधि/लाइनज।
- २- सदाई/लाइनजूकायालिय में०
- ३- लोको फोरमैन/वारबाग
- ४- कार्याधिकूर्ति बिल दार्दिकूर्ति लाइनज कायालिय में
- ५- संबंधित दर्मचारी
- ६- मण्डल मंत्री/निम्न
- ७- अतिरिक्त प्रति

६०/- कृते मण्डल रेल प्रबंधकौ का  
लाइनज

Rajendra Singh

Allen the 20th  
July 1988



Registered

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AT ALLAHABAD  
CIRCUIT BENCH, GANDHI BHAWAN  
LUCKNOW

No. CAT/CB/LKO/ 624

Dated : 28/11/2014

OFFICE - MEMO

Registration No. O.A. 214 of 193<sup>1</sup> T.A. 8(1)

Applicant's

Rayendra Singh  
Versys

Respondent's

U o k a

A copy of the Tribunal's Order/Judgement  
dated \_\_\_\_\_ in the abovenoted case is forwarded  
for necessary action.

For DEPUTY REGISTRAR (H)

Encl : Copy of Order/Judgement dated \_\_\_\_\_

To.

Dr. R. B. Handley, Advocate

610, Zakharia Bhawan,

dimesh ✓

卷之三

Particulars to be ExaminedEndorsement as to result of Examination

(c) Are the documents referred to in (a) above neatly typed in double space ? yes

8. Has the index of documents been filed and paging done properly ? - yes -

9. Have the chronological details of representation made and the outcome of such representations been indicated in the application ? - yes -

10. Is the matter raised in the application pending before any Court of law or any other Bench of Tribunal ? - No -

11. Are the application/duplicate copy/spare copies signed ? - yes -

12. Are extra copies of the application with Annexures filed ? - No -

(a) Identical with the original ? /

(b) Defective ? /

(c) Wanting in Annexures /

Nos...../Pages Nos..... ? /

13. Have file size envelopes bearing full addresses, of the respondents been filed ? - N.A. yes -

14. Are the given addresses, the registered addresses ? - yes -

15. Do the names of the parties stated in the copies tally with those indicated in the application ? - yes -

16. Are the translations certified to be true or supported by an Affidavit affirming that they are true ? - yes -

17. Are the facts of the case mentioned in item No. 6 of the application ? - yes -

(a) Concise ? /

(b) Under distinct heads ? /

(c) Numbered consecutively ? /

(d) Typed in double space on one side of the paper ? /

18. Have the particulars for interim order prayed for indicated with reasons ? - yes -

19. Whether all the remedies have been exhausted. - yes -

Use this leave  
Henceforth for 25.11.88.

24.11.88

24.11.88

Version  
**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**ADDITIONAL BENCH,**

23-A, Thornhill Road, Allahabad-211001

Registration No. 214 of 1988

APPLICANT (s) Rajendra Singh

RESPONDENT(s) Union of India & others

Particulars to be examined	Endorsement as to result of Examination
1. Is the appeal competent ?	— yes —
2. (a) Is the application in the prescribed form ?	— yes — (in old proforma)
(b) Is the application in paper book form ?	— yes —
(c) Have six complete sets of the application been filed ?	— 2 sets filed .
3. (a) Is the appeal in time ?	— yes —
(b) If not, by how many days it is beyond time ?	— / —
(c) Has sufficient cause for not making the application in time, been filed ?	— / —
4. Has the document of authorisation/Vakalat-nama been filed ?	— yes —
5. Is the application accompanied by B.D./Postal-Order for Rs. 50/-	— yes —
6. Has the certified copy/copies of the order (s) against which the application is made been filed ?	— yes —
7. (a) Have the copies of the documents/relied upon by the applicant and mentioned in the application, been filed ?	— yes —
(b) Have the documents referred to in (a) above duly attested by a Gazetted Officer and numbered accordingly ?	yes — say (both cases)