

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

~~Q.A. No.~~

199

T.A. NO: 226/87

DATE OF DECISION 11.3.1992

Shri S.R. Bharathi & Others Petitioner

Shri G.C. Chaubey Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & Others Respondent

Shri Sanyal Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE U.C. SRIVASTAVA, VICE CHAIRMAN.

The Hon'ble Mr. M.Y. PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A).

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? ✓
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? ✓
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? ✓

mbm*

(U.C. SRIVASTAVA)
VICE CHARMAN.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY BENCH
CIRCUIT BENCH : NAGPUR

Registration T.A. No. 226 of 1987

S.R.Bharathi & Others

Applicants

Vs.

Union of India & Others

Respondents

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C.

Hon'ble Mr. M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A)

APPEARANCE:

Shri G.C.Chaubey for the applicant

Shri Sanyala for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT:

(PER: Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava V.C.)

Dated : 11.3.1992

This application is filed by the six persons out of which the name of Applicants Nos. 2, 4 & 6 has already been deleted, as they have retired from service. It appears that some letter was also received on behalf of applicant no.5 Sri M.B.Mogre who too has retired from service. The applicant no.1 S.R.Bharti ~~who has~~ retired from service while applicant no.3 is still in service. Shri Sanyal learned counsel for the respondents has stated that because these applications were not found to be/proper ⁱⁿ address that is why a chargesheet was issued to them and all these applicants submitted their reply ~~without~~ ^{any} delay. A minor punishment of withholding their passes for two years was given to them. Subsequently they were also transferred but the transfer is not linked with this application although the transfer order was stayed by

the High Court with the result the applicants got their desired relief. But by lapse of time this application has become infructuous. It has been further stated that so far as applicant no.1 is concerned although he had made reference to compulsory retirement but the same is not the subject matter of this application. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel that the period of punishment is over and the applicants have retired this application has become infructuous and it is dismissed.



Member (A)



Vice-Chairman.

11th March, 1992, Nagpur.

(sph)