

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 74/1991
~~XXXXXX~~

198

DATE OF DECISION 19.4.1991

Karbhari Kishan Kahandol PetitionerMr.S.Paul Sundararajan Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.S.Chaudhuri, Member (A)

The Hon'ble Mr. T.C.Reddy, Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? Yes
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 ?


(P.S.Chaudhuri)
Member(A)

(3)
BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW BOMBAY BENCH, NEW BOMBAY

* * * * *

Original Application No. 74/91

Karbhari Kishan Kahandol,
Token No.NS 144, Baling Operator,
The Currency Note Press,
Nasik Road 422 101.
Maharashtra

... Applicant

V/s

1. The Union of India through
The Secretary, Ministry of Finance,
Department of Economic Affairs,
New Delhi 110 001.

2. The General Manager,
Currency Note Press,
Nasik Road 422 101.

... Respondents

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

Appearances:

Mr. Paul Sundararajan, Advocate,
for the applicant.

ORAL JUDGEMENT:

Dated : 19.4.1991

(Per. P.S.Chaudhuri, Member (A))

This application under Section 19 of the
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 was filed on 15.2.91.
In it the applicant who is working as Baling Operator
in Currency Note Press, Nasik Road, is challenging the
the order dated 24.12.1990 by which respondent No. 2
has promoted one M.S.Jadhav to the post of Junior
Checker.

2. We have heard Mr. S.Paul Sundararajan, learned
counsel for the applicant. It is the applicant's case
that he has submitted a representation in the matter
on 26.12.1990 and followed up with a legal notice on
7.1.1991 but has yet received no response to either.

(W)

It is thus clear that although the applicant has exercised his rights for redressal of grievances, a period of six months has not yet elapsed since he did so. Against this background, we have no difficulty in holding that this application is premature. We are satisfied that it would be in the best interest of justice to dispose of this application at this stage with a suitable direction to the respondents, even though the respondents are not before us at this stage, because the proposed direction is an innocuous one.

3. We accordingly dispose of this application at the admission stage itself with a direction to the respondents to dispose of the applicant's representation dated 26.12.1990, including the facts brought out in the lawyer's notice dated 7.1.1991, by 26.6.1991. If the applicant continues to be aggrieved after such final orders have passed, he is at liberty to approach this Tribunal afresh, if so advised. There will be no order as to costs.

T. C. — — — P

(T.C.Reddy)
Member(J)



(P.S.Chaudhuri)
Member(A)