

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. : 588/2000

Date of Decision : 13.11.2000

N.L.Ratnam Raju _____ Applicant.

Shri R.P.Saxena _____ Advocate for the
Applicant.

VERSUS

Union of India & Ors. _____ Respondents.

Shri V.D.Vadhavkar
for Shri M.I.Sethna _____ Advocate for the
Respondents.

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Shri S.L.Jain, Member (J)

The Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member (A)

(i) To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
(ii) Whether it needs to be circulated to other
Benches of the Tribunal ?
(iii) Library

JL
(S.L.JAIN)
MEMBER (J)

mrj*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

OA.NO.588/2000

Monday this the 13th day of November,2000.

CORAM : Hon'ble Shri S.L.Jain, Member (J)

Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastry, Member (A)

N.L.Ratnam Raju,
48, Moti Bhavan,
5, Dr.D'Silva Road,
Dadar (West), Mumbai.

... Applicant

By Advocate Shri R.P.Saxena

V/S.

1. Union of India through
The Secretary, Govt. of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block, New Delhi.
2. The Director,
Intelligence Bureau,
Govt. of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi.
3. The Assistant Director,
Subsidiary Intelligence Bureau,
(MHA), Govt. of India,
'E' Block, C-23,
Bandra-Kurla Complex,
Bandra, Mumbai.

... Respondents

By Advocate Shri V.D.Vadhavkar
for Shri M.I.Sethna

O R D E R

{Per : Shri S.L.Jain, Member (J)}

This is an application under Section 19 of the A.T.Act,
1985 for a direction to the appellate authority, Respondent No. 1
to consider and decide the appeal dated 18.11.1999.

S.L.Jain - ..2/-

2. The applicant has filed an appeal against the punishment order dated 29.9.1999 on 18.11.1999. He further represented the matter vide letter dated 5.6.2000 and 13.7.2000. The appeal is still said to be pending with Respondent No. 1.

3. Nearly one year has lapsed after filing the appeal. In such circumstances, the Respondent No.1 is ordered to decide the appeal of the applicant dated 18.11.1999 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order.

4. The applicant's counsel stated that the applicant has asked for personal hearing. If that is so, then the respondents are bound to afford a personal hearing to the applicant. On perusal of the appeal, we do not find that such a prayer is asked for. However, such a prayer is made in the OA. The applicant is at liberty to further represent the matter with the Respondent No.1 for affording the personal hearing. The respondents shall be at liberty to decide the matter in accordance with law.

5. In the result, the Oa. is disposed of with a direction that Respondent No. 1 shall decide the appeal within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

Shanta Shastray
(SMT.SHANTA SHAstry)

MEMBER (A)

S.L.Jain
(S.L.JAIN)

MEMBER (J)

mrj.

C.P./No: 101
fixed for orders
on 30.3.01

M.P./No: 248/01
for condonation of delay
for filing a m.p. for
extension of time,
fixed on 30.3.01

M.P./No: 247/01 ^{29/3}
for extension of time,
fixed on 30.3.01

247

Dated: 30.3.2001 (62)

Applicant by Shri R.P. Sascena.
Respondents by Shri V.D. Vadlakar for
Shri M.I. Sethna.

M.P. 247/2001 and 248/2001 heard
and allowed.

Shri R.P. Sascena states that
he does not want to press the C.P.
16/2001. C.P. 16/2001 stands disposed
of as not pressed.

order

1/9/01

Shant &

81.871/

(Ms. Shanta Shastri)

(S. L. Jain)

m(j)

m(A)

11

order/Judgement despatched
to Applicant/Respondent(s)
on 24/04/01

No
3014