

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1986.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy
And

.. Vice-Chairman.

Hon'ble Mr. L.H.A. Rego.

.. Member(A).

APPLICATION NUMBER 18 OF 1986.

Abdul Gafoor,
Aged about 30 years,
Son of late Ghulam Mustafa,
Ex.M.T.Driver(L.G),
Civil Aviation Department,
Aerodrome Office,
Bangalore Air Port.

.. Applicant.

(By Sri M.R.Achar, Advocate).

v.

1. The Government of India,
Ministry of Civil Aviation,
New Delhi by its Secretary.
2. The Director General of
Civil Aviation, Block-II & III
East, R.K.Puram, NEWDELHI-66.
3. The Regional Director,
Civil Aviation Department,
Madras Region, Madras-27.
4. The Director,
Air Routes and Aerodrome,
Madras Region, Madras Airport.
5. The Aerodrome Officer,
Civil Aviation Department,
Bangalore Airport,
Bangalore-560 017.

.. Respondents.

(By Sri M.S. Padmarajaiah, Standing Counsel.)

This application coming for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

O R D E R

In this transferred application received from the High

High Court of Karnataka under Section 29 of the Administrative Tribunals Act of 1985('the Act'), the applicant has challenged certain orders made by respondents 4 and 5.

2. At the material time, the applicant was working as an M.T.Driver (L.G) at Bangalore Airport which was then part of the Civil Aviation Department of the Government of India. By the National Airport Authority Act of 1985 (Central Act No.16 of 1985) (NAA Act) and the Notification issued thereunder the airports in the Country have been taken over by a statutory authority called the National Airports Authority (NAA) from 1-6-1986. Section 13(g) of the NAA Act has provided for the continuance of disputes and legal proceedings pending as on 1-6-1986 against the NAA. The NAA which is a statutory authority is not one of the authorities over which the Tribunals constituted under the Act are conferred with jurisdiction under Section 14(2) of the Act. Even though this Tribunal had jurisdiction initially to adjudicate the dispute raised by the applicant that dispute cannot now be adjudicated by this Tribunal.

3. Sri M.S.Padmarajaiah, learned Central Government Standing Counsel, therefore, contends that this application should be rejected reserving liberty to the applicant to approach the appropriate forum for relief. Sri M.Raghavendrachar, learned counsel for the applicant, in our opinion, very rightly does not oppose this submission of Sri Padmarajaiah.

4. On the foregoing discussion, we hold that this application is liable to be dismissed with liberty reserved to the applicant to work out his legal remedies before an appropriate forum. We, therefore, dismiss this application with no order