

(20)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 406/86

~~XXXXXX~~

198

DATE OF DECISION 12.7.1991

SHRI H.R.CHASWAL, & ors.

Petitioner

None

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & ors.

Respondent

Mr.M.I.Sethna, Sr.Counsel

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

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

The Hon'ble Mr. **T.C.REDDY, MEMBER(J)**

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 in needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

(21)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW BOMBAY

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.406/86

SHRI H.R.CHASWAL,
and other 48
All working as controllers
in the office of joint Chief
Controller of Imports and
Exports, New C.G.O. Building,
New Marine Lines, Bombay -20

.... Applicants

Vs.

The Union of India
and ors.

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI M.Y.PRIOLKAR, Member(A)

HON'BLE SHRI T.C.REDDY, MEMBER(J)

Appearance:

None for the
Applicant

Mr.M.I.Sethna, Sr.Counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT

DATED: 12.7.1991

(PER : M.Y.PRIOLKAR, M(A)

This case was fixed for final hearing on 9.4.1990 but had been adjourned on that day to 26.6.1990, at the request of the applicant's counsel. Again on 26.6.1990, at the applicant's request, it was adjourned to 22.8.1990 for final hearing. On that date it was listed for final hearing on 24th September 1990 and further on 7.2.1991 and 4.6.1991 for hearing. On 21.6.1991 again none was present for the applicant and the case was adjourned to 12.7.1991 for final hearing. But today again, none has appeared for the applicant, nor the applicant or his advocate has sent any communication in this regard for adjournement or otherwise. It appears, therefore, that the