

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 638/91

199

T.A. NO: ---

DATE OF DECISION 4-3-1992

Tapas Kumar Neogy

Petitioner

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Collector, Daman and ors.

Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

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

The Hon'ble Mr. ---

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? Y
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? N
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? N
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? N

MD


(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)

mbm*

(4)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A.638/91

TAPAS KUMAR NEGTY,
Architect Planner,
Department of Planning &
Architecture,
Union Territory of Daman
and Diu,
Moti Daman - 396 220.

.. Applicant

vs.

1. Sanjay P.Singh,
Collector and District
Magistrate,
Office of the Collector,
Collectorate,
Daman,
Union Territory of Daman &
Diu,
Moti Daman 396 220.
2. Bhanu Prakash Singh,
Administrator,
U.T.Daman and Diu,
Office of H.E., the
Governor of Goa,
Cabo Raj Bhavan,
Dona Paula,
Panaji, Goa - 403 001.
3. Union of India
through
Respondent No.2 .. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A)

Appearances:

None for either
side.

ORAL JUDGMENT: Date: 4-3-1992
(Per M.Y.Priolkar, Member(A))

This application had been filed on 24-9-1991 challenging the restrictions placed on Group 'A' Officers for leaving headquarter except with the permission of the Administrator and also against warning given and treating the period of absence of the applicant for the period 20-7-1991 to 28-7-1991 as dies-non although he had applied for casual leave for this period.

2. On both the earlier occasions when this case had come up for admission/hearing learned counsel for the applicant had requested

- : 2 :-

for adjournment. On the last date ie.27-1-1992 which was also fixed at the request of the counsel for the applicant, none was present on behalf of the applicant and the matter had been adjourned to today for hearing on admission.

3. Even today none is present for the applicant. However, the applicant has sent a letter dtd. 13-11-1991, which appears to have been received in the Registry on 26-11-1991, ^{it appears to have been} ~~in this letter~~ placed on record only now. The applicant states that he is withdrawing this application viz. O.A.638/91.

4. In view of the above, the application is finally disposed of as withdrawn at the request of the applicant. There will be no order as to costs.

MD

M.Y. Priolkar
(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
Member(A)