

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: Stamp No. 904/92 (O.A 1252/92)

Transfer Application No:

DATE OF DECISION 11.11.92

Shri Dharm Das Petitioner

Shri P.M.Shah. Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Chief of the Naval Staff, Respondent
Naval Headquarters
New Delhi. and others.

Shri V.S.Masurkar Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice Chairman.

The Hon'ble ~~Shri~~ Ms. Usha Savara, 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 ?

Sub
(S.K.DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Stamp No. 904/92 (O.A. 1252/92)

Shri Dharm Das

... Applicant.

V/s.

Chief of the Naval Staff,
Naval Headquarters
New Delhi.

Flag Officer Commanding-in-
Chief, Western Naval Command
Headquarters, Bombay.

The Commodore, Bureau of
Sailors, Cheetah Camp,
Mankhurd, Bombay.

Union of India through
respondent No.1.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Usha Savara, Member (A)

Appearance

Shri P.M. Shah, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri V.S. Masurkar, counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

¶ Per Shri S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman ¶

The applicant is posted at Bombay. In
pursuance of the directions given by means of a telegram
dated 4.11.92 by the Flag Officer, Commanding-in-Chief,
Western Naval Command, The commander has passed a
movement order attaching temporarily the applicant
with the N.D. (B). In substance, the order dated
4.11.92 passed by the Flag Officer Commanding-in-Chief,
West, is being challenged in the present application.

We are not inclined to interfere with
the impugned order at this stage. No injustice has

....2...

been caused to the applicant. He has not been transferred out side Bombay. We make it clear that there will be no change in the emoluments of the applicant whatsoever, if the impugned order is implemented. On the whole, we do not consider a fit case for interference.

This application is dismissed **summarily**.

U. Savarkar
11.11.42
(USHA SAVARKAR)
MEMBER (A)

S. K. OHAON
(S. K. OHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/