

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 1008/92

199

T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION 29.9.1992

SHRI BHIMRAO SAKHARAM BHOSALE Petitioner

Shri C.D. Narolkar, Ad. Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

The Director, S.I.S.I, Andheri Respondent  
East, Bombay.

None Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble ~~Ms.~~ USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (A)

The Hon'ble Mr.

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 ?

*Forward*  
(USHA SAVARA)  
M/A

23.9.92

mbm\*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH

O.A.NO.1008/92

Shri Bhimrao Sakhararam Bhosale,  
Andheri (E), Bombay. .. Applicant

V/s

The Director,  
Small Industries Service Inst.  
(SISI), Andheri(E), Bombay. .. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MEMBER USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (A)

Appearance :

Shri C.D.Nargolkar, Adv.  
for the applicant.

None for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

DATED : 29.9.1992

(PER:USHA SAVARA, M/A)

This application has been filed impugning the order of transfer dated 21st SEPT 1992 from Bombay to Nagpur. It is submitted by Shri Nargolkar that the applicant, who is a Watchman, was transferred to Bombay only on 29.4.1992. His daughter had a major operation in the K.E.M.Hospital on 7th May 1992 and there is need to undergo another operation which is fixed on 20.10.1992 in the same hospital. It is also his contention that the applicant has been transferred from Bombay only to accommodate Shri B.B.Lote, who has requested for transfer from Nagpur to Bombay. Admittedly, the applicant has not made any representation to the authorities and has rushed to the Court on getting transfer order. It has been held by the Full Bench in the case of B. Parameshwar Rao V/s ~~Divisional Eng.~~ Telecommunications that it is incumbent upon the applicant to make a representation to the authorities and wait for

*[Signature]*

.2..

a period of six months atleast before filing an application in the Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the application is premature. Shri Nargolkar submits that he would be satisfied, if a direction could be given to the respondents to consider a representation of the applicant, which he will now make, and pass a self speaking detailed order on merits.

2. In the circumstances, the applicant ~~will~~ make a representation to the authorities concerned. The Director, Small Industries Service Inst. Bombay is directed to pass a self speaking order, on merits on the representation received from the applicant within a period of one month on receipt of the representation. In view of the difficulties pointed out by the applicant a sympathetic view may be taken and the representation be disposed of within the time indicated above. The application is disposed of accordingly with no orders as to costs.

MASTI ALLOWED

*Usha Savara*  
(USHA SAVARA)  
M/A

srl