

(07)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 229/91
T.A. No.

198

DATE OF DECISION 30.3.92Shri Rajendre P. Keshri PetitionerMr. M. S. Ramamurthi Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

General Manager, WR, Charchgate, Respondent
BombayMr. A. L. Kasture, Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE U.C. SHRIVASTAVA, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. M.Y. PRIOLKAR, 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?

MGIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000


 (U.C. SHRIVASTAVA)
 Vice-Chairman

TAKT

(08)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION 229/91

Shri Rajendra P. Keshri
residing in Ganga Smruti,
Virar (E), Distt. Thane
and formerly employed as Mobile Booking clerk at
Vasai road, Western Railway, Ditt. Thane.Applicant

V/s

The Union of India
through the General Manager,
Western Railway, Churchgate, Bombay -20

2. Senior Divisional Commercial Supdt.
W.R. Bombay, Central, Bombay - 400008

3. Divisional Commercial Supdt.
Wester Railway, Bombay, Central,
Bombay - 400 008

CORAM : HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI U.C. SHRIVASTAVA, Vice-Chairman
HON'BLE MEMBER SHRI M.Y. PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A)

Appearance :

Mr. M.S. Ramamurthy, Adv.
for the applicant.

Mr. A.L.Kasture, Adv.
for the respondents.

✓

CJ

ORAL JUDGMENT:

DATED: 30.3.92

(PER: U C Srivastava, Vice Chairman)

Mr. M S Ramamurthi, Advocate for the applicant. Mr. A L Kasture, Advocate for the respondents.

Admit.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that this application has become infuctous as the applicant has now been empanneled.

Shri Ramamurthi, learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant has been empanneled but his right for claiming seniority and certain other benefits are still alive and would like to reserve the same for future. He has no objection in case the application is dismissed as infuctous with the above reservation. It is for the applicant to agitate any other matter, but in view of the fact that he has already been empanneled this application is disposed of as infuctous with the above observations.

No order as to costs.

(M Y PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(U C SRIVASTAVA)
VICE CHAIRMAN