

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

~~NEW DELHI~~

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

CAMP AT PANAJI (GOA)

O.A. No. 198

T.A. No.

St. Application No. _____/89

DATE OF DECISION 24.8.1989Shri Iqbal M. Khan

Petitioner

Applicant in person.Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Director General,Dept. of Tourism, Transport Bhavan, Respondent
New Delhi.- Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. M.B. Mujumdar, Member (J)

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

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? Yes

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? No

3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? No

4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? No

2

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
CIRCUIT SITTINGS AT PANAJI (GOA)

St. Application No. _____ of 1989

Shri Iqbal M. Khan,
In front of Sardar Manzil,
Chati,
Aurangabad (M.S.)

.. Applicant

V/s.

Director General,
Department of Tourism,
Transport Bhavan,
New Delhi.

.. Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Member(J), Shri M.B. Mujumdar
Hon'ble Member(A), Shri M.Y. Priolkar

ORAL JUDGMENT:
(Per: Shri M.B. Mujumdar, Member(J))

Dated: 24.8.1989


Heard the applicant in person. The applicant has sent an application by Registered Post on 1.8.1989 to our office at New Bombay. As he wants an interim relief from this Tribunal he has filed another application for interim relief along with a copy of the application dated 1.8.1989.


2. In para 9, the applicant has prayed for the following relief: To compensate the applicant for the injustices done to him in the past and to issue the foreign posting order in favour of the applicant immediately for Los Angeles/Frankfurt/Paris/Amsterdam Tokyo or Australia.

3. The applicant could not show us any rule under which we can give such direction to the respondent. It is the case of the applicant that his juniors are being sent because he is having less than 1 1/2 years service left before retirement. In our opinion it is for the authorities concerned to decide as to whom they should give foreign postings. Hence we cannot give such

3

a direction as prayed for in para 9 of the application.
In our opinion the application is mis-conceived and
hence it is rejected summarily. The prayer for
interim relief is also rejected.


(M.Y. Priolkar)
Member (A)


(M.B. Mujumdar)
Member (J)

Judgment - dt. 24/8/89
Send to parties
on 21/9/89.


21/9/89

Judgment dt. 24.8.89
Served on Applicant
on dt. 27.9.89


11/10/89