

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 384/92

199

XXXXXX

DATE OF DECISION 28.10.92

Smt. Rewa Jwala Prasad Petitioner

Shri D.V. Gangal Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others. Respondent

Shri J.G. Sawant. 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 ?

N.D

by
(S.K.DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN.

mbm*
C.R.A.:

(CC)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 384/92

SMT: Rewa Jwala Prasad
V/s.

... Applicant

The Union of India through
Chief Engineer(South)
Construction,
Central Railway, Bombay.

Deputy Chief Executive
Engineer, (Construction),
Central Railway, Panvel.

The then P.W.I. Construction
Central Railway
Panvel

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member(A).

Appearance:

Shri D.V. Gangal, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri J.G. Sawant, counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 28.10.92

(Per Shri S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman)

The applicant was appointed as Khalasi
with effect from 21.11.81. According to the respondents,
she did not report to duty on 5.11.83 and thereafter,
therefore her name was struck off from the muster-roll.
It appears that no order terminating her services were
communicated to her. She has now approached this Tribunal
by means of this application under section 19.

We had directed to issue notice to the
respondents. In response to the notice, Shri Sawant
~~has~~ put in appearance on behalf of the respondents.
There is an application seeking the condonation of delay
for filing this application. We are not satisfied with
the explanation offered for coming to this Tribunal at
such a belated stage. However, in view of the fact
that the applicant had worked for about 2 years

(S)

: 2 :

as casual labour and she is willing to work even now in that capacity, we entertain this application.

The respondents will consider the case of the applicant for fresh appointment on merits and in accordance with law. We hope that the bar of age will not come in the way of the applicant.

With these observations this application is disposed off finally. There shall be no order as to costs.


(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER(A)


(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/