

## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH  
 STAMP APPLICATION NO. 819/91  
 O.A. No. 11192 198  
 T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 1-1-1992

ARUN KUMAR SIDHPURI  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Petitioner

Mr. G K Masand & Mr. G S WALIA Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & 2 ORS. Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

## CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE U C SRIVASTAVA, VICE CHAIRMAN

The Hon'ble Mr. M Y PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? 4
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? N
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? N
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? N

MOIPRRND-12 CAT/86-3-12-86-15,000

  
 V.O.

(1)

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

ARUN KUMAR SIDHPURI  
4/515 Mahajani Marg  
Matunga  
Bombay 400 019

..Applicant

V/s.

1. Union of India through  
Secretary  
Ministry of Information  
& Broadcasting, New Delhi
2. The Director General  
Doordarshan  
Doordarshan Bhavan  
Mandi House  
New Delhi
3. Director  
Doordarshan Kendra  
Bombay.

..Respondents

CORAM: HON. SHRI JUSTICE U S SRIVASTAVA, V.C.  
HON. SHRI M Y PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A)

APPEARANCE

Mr. G K MASAND  
MR. G S WALIA  
Advocates  
for the applicant

ORAL JUDGMENT  
(PER: U C SRIVASTAVA, VICE CHAIRMAN)

DATED: 1-1-1992

Against the transfer order dated 9.12.91 to Shillong the applicant who had stayed in Bombay for 14 years in Door Darshan Kendra has approached the Tribunal. The grievance of the applicant is ~~is~~ that earlier in 1986 he had to forgo his promotion and transfer to Nagpur due to sickness of his aged parents, with the result he could not be promoted for a period of one year. Though vacancies arose in the subsequent years the applicant was not promoted and others were promoted who were junior to him. Abruptly in the year 1991 he has been promoted and posted to Shillong knowing very well that his father who is ailing is being looked after by him. The applicant preferred an application/representation dated 10.12.91 to the department and the department has not disposed of the same.

We do not propose to interfere with the transfer order which is challenged as the transfers are in the exigency ~~of~~ and situation. We do not know under what circumstances ~~under~~ ~~what~~ the transfer order has been passed by the respondents. We would only direct the respondents to dispose of the representation of the applicant within three weeks based on the pleas and grounds against the transfer to Shillong as well as the loss which he has suffered by not accepting the promotion earlier and his non-promotion thereafter.

With the above observations the application is disposed off with no order as to costs.

Let this judgment's copy be given to the applicant within one week by the Registry.



( M Y PRIOLKAR )  
MEMBER(A)



( U C SRIVASTAVA )  
VICE CHAIRMAN

trk/-