

(2)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 931/92

199

~~XXX~~ NO:

DATE OF DECISION 30-11-1992

C B Patil

Petitioner

Mr. V G Pashte

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

**CORAM:**

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S K Dhaon, 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 ?

NR

*Ag.  
V.C.*

mbm\*

TRK

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH, "GULESTAN" BUILDING NO.6  
PRESCOT ROAD; BOMBAY-1

OA No.931/92

C B Patil  
Ex. Asstt. Guard Bhusawal  
Division; Central Railway  
Bhusawal;  
R/o. Gurukripa, Near Bus Stand  
At. Post. Khadka Tal. Bhusawal  
Dist. Jalgaon. ..Applicant

V/s.

1. General Manager  
Central Railway  
Bombay V.T.
2. Divisional Railway Manager  
Bhusawal Division  
Central Railway  
Bhusawal. ..Respondents

Coram: Hon. Shri Justice S K Dhaon, V.C.  
Hon. Shri M Y Priolkar, Member (A)

ORAL JUDGMENT: DATED: 30-11-1992  
(Per: S K Dhaon, Vice Chairman)

It appears that either pending  
the investigation of the criminal case or  
during the pendency of the criminal case the  
applicant was suspended from service with  
effect from 25.12.1983. He was acquitted  
by [a] competent court on 21.1.1986. He was  
taken back on duty on 28.2.1986. The contro-  
versy is regarding the payment of full wages  
between 25.12.1983 and 27.2.1986. It appears  
that no orders have been issued or passed by the  
relevant authority.

2. The D.R.M.(P) Bhusawal on 5.4.89 (4)

had informed the applicant that the matter is in correspondence with C.P.O., BB,. On 2-11-89 the D.R.M. Bhusawal sent a communication to the Commandant, RPF Bhusawal and sought some information from the latter.

3. The authority concerned is directed to take the final decision as to whether the applicant should be treated on duty between the periods of his suspension or not as expeditiously as possible but not beyond a period of two months from the date of production of a certified copy of this order by the applicant, before it.

With these directions the application is disposed of finally with no order as to costs.

( M Y Priolkar )  
Member (A)

( S K Dhaon )  
Vice Chairman