

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 729
T.A. No.

1987/

DATE OF DECISION 22/11/91Shri S. G. Deshmukh PetitionerShri K. D. Kulkarini Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Dept. of post Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C. Srivastava, V.C.

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

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

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY BENCH
Registration O.A.No. 729 of 1991

S.G.Deshmukk

Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Others

Respondents

Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C.

22/11/91

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

(By Hon. Mr. Justice U.C.Srivastava, V.C.)

The applicant ~~who~~ worked for 3 years in place of his father as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master. A fresh appointment for regular staff is made and the applicant was not appointed as his name was not sent from the employment exchange. Feeling aggrieved against the same he approached this Tribunal.

2. On behalf of the respondents learned counsel stated on the basis of the records that the applicant's name was not moved by the employment exchange and that is why he has not been selected. It is further stated that the applicant had given in writing himself that he would like to devote himself in agriculture and there is no time for this work, and that is why there is no question of appointing him.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant said that somebody else had written the said letter, but the signatures of the applicant ~~mixtum~~ ^{to be} is responsible for the same. There appears/ no merit in the application Accordingly this application is dismissed.


Member (A)


Vice-Chairman.

22nd November, 1991, Bombay.

(sph)