

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH  
\*\*\*\*\*

Commercial Complex (BDA)  
Indiranagar  
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 21 JUL 1988

APPLICATION NO.

493

/ 88(F)

W.P. NO.

Applicant(s)

Shri C. Ramaswamy

V/s

Respondent(s)

The Supdt. RMS, Bangalore & another

To

1. Shri C. Ramaswamy  
D.No. 435, 5th Cross  
Gandhinagar  
Mysore - 7
2. Shri M. Raghavendra Achar  
Advocate  
1074-1075, Banashankari I Stage  
Sreenivasaangar II Phase  
Bangalore - 560 050
3. The Superintendent  
R.M.S. 'Q' Division  
Bangalore - 560 026
4. The Sub-Record Officer (LSG)  
RMS 'Q' Division  
Mysore - 570 021
5. Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah  
Central Govt. Stng Counsel  
High Court Building  
Bangalore - 560 001

Subject : SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~REPLY/INTERIM ORDER~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said application(s) on 18-7-88.

Encl : As above

*RECEIVED  
21/7/88*  
D/C  
B. Venkatesh  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
(JUDICIAL)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF JULY, 1988

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman  
and  
Hon'ble Shri L.H.A. Reyo, Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 493/88

Shri C. Ramaswamy,  
D.No.435, 5th Cross,  
Gandhinagar,  
Mysore- 7. ... Applicant.

(Shri M. Raghavendrachar, Advocate)

v.

1. The Superintendent,  
R.M.S. ('Q' Division),  
Bangalore - 26.
2. Sub-Record Officer,  
(LSG), R.M.S. 'Q' Division,  
Mysore. ... Respondents.

(Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah, C.G.S.S.C.)

This application having come up for hearing to-day,  
Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

In this application made under Section 19 of the  
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act'), the  
applicant has challenged his apprehended termination  
from the post of **Part Time Mazdoor**.

2. In their reply, the Respondents, in narrating the  
circumstances leading to the recruitment with which we  
are not now concerned, have asserted that the applicant  
had not so far been terminated from service. If that  
is so, then the grievance of the applicant is really  
premature. On this short ground this application is  
liable to be dismissed.



3. Even otherwise as and when the applicant is terminated from service, it is undoubtedly open to him to challenge the order of termination on all such grounds as are available to him. But before that there is no justification to examine the grievance of the applicant.

4. On any view this application is liable to be dismissed. We, therefore, dismiss this application.

But in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN (S)

bsv/Mrv.

Sd/-

MEMBER (A) V 18-7-88

TRUE COPY

*R. V. Venkatesh*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JULY 1988)  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE