

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH,  
BOMBAY.

Original Application No. 386/91.

Shri V.K.Pani,  
30, Yogini Co-op Housing Society Ltd.,  
Patharli Road, Gograswadi,  
Dombivli East - 421 201. ... Applicant.

V/s.

Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.  
Telephone House, Dadar West,  
Bombay - 400 028. ... Respondent.

Coram: Hon'ble Member(A), Shri P.S.Chaudhuri,  
Hon'ble Member(J), Shri T.C.Reddy.

Appearances:-

Applicant in person.  
None for the respondents.

Oral Judgment:-

¶ Per Shri P.S.Chaudhuri, Member(A) Dated: 19.8.1991.

This application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 was filed on 1.7.1991. In it the applicant, who is employed as Accounts Officer (Internal Auditor), Mahanagar Telephones Nigam Ltd., Bombay is seeking 7 reliefs which we will deal with later.

2. We have heard the applicant in person.
3. The first four reliefs claimed by the applicant pertain to the furnishing of information regarding authority under which power to transfer has been exercised, reasons which allowed recording of minutes in a particular way, *for redressal of grievances.* guidelines regarding transfers and machinery available Requests for information are not reliefs and so we have no hesitation in summarily rejecting these four prayers.
4. The fifth prayer is for a direction not to harrass the applicant by frequent transfers. No details of transfers have been furnished and so this is not a case where the applicant is challenging any specific order of transfer. In B.Parameshwara Rao v. The Divisional Engineer,

(u)

Telecommunications, Elluru and another, O.A. 27/90 before the Hyderabad Bench, a full Bench of this Tribunal has indicated that the cardinal feature of the provisions of Section 19 of the Central Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 is that the person must be aggrieved by an order.

In other words, it means that until <sup>an</sup> order has been passed which causes a grievance to the applicant, he cannot approach the Tribunal under Section 19 of the said Act. Another way of putting this is that the applicant must indicate the order by which he is aggrieved. This has not been done in this case. So, we must reject this prayer of the applicant.

5. The 7th prayer of the applicant relates to the review of alleged arbitrary nature of transfers. This prayer, too, must be rejected on the same grounds as the 5th prayer.

6. This brings us to the sixth prayer of the applicant which pertains to costs. As we have rejected all the remaining prayers of the applicant at the admission stage itself without having served the respondents, the question of costs does not arise.

7. In this view of the matter we see no merit in the application and are of the opinion that it merits rejection at the admission stage itself.

8. The application is accordingly summarily rejected under section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The applicant will always be at liberty to file a fresh application in accordance with law, if so advised.

T. C. Chaudhury  
(T.C. REDDY)  
MEMBER(J)

P. S. Chaudhury  
(P.S. CHAUDHURI)  
MEMBER(A).