

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 461/92 199  
T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION 16.7.1992

SRHI ANIL S. WASNIK Petitioner

S.V.R. MURTHY Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE Respondent  
Bombay -III

Shri Ramesh Darda Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. 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 ?

(S.K.DHAON)  
V/C

mbm\*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH  
CAMP AT NAGPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 461/92

Shri Anil S. Wasnik,  
Nagpur

.... Applicant

V/s

1. Collector of Central Excise,  
Bombay - III,  
Nav Prabhat Chambers,  
Ranade Road, Dadar, (W)  
Bombay.
2. Collector of Central Excise,  
Nagpur, Telenkhedi Road,  
Civil Lines, Nagpur.
3. Secretary,  
Central Excise and Customs Board,  
New Delhi.

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.K. DHAON, Vice-Chairman  
HON'BLE USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (A)

Appearance :

Mr. S.V.R. Murthy, Adv.  
for the applicant.

Shri Ramesh Darda, Adv.  
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

16.7.1992

(PER : JUSTICE S.K. DHAON, Vice-Chairman)

On or before 10.8.1988 the applicant was working as Inspector in Central Excise, Bombay, - III Collectorate. On that day, the Dy. Collector (P and E) Nagpur passed an order transferring him in the same capacity to the Collectorate Nagpur at Inter-Collectorate transfer. Thereafter, the applicant joined at Nagpur and even now he is posted there. His grievance is that for the purpose of determining his seniority, the length of the service rendered by him at Bombay is not being taken into account.

2. A counter affidavit has been filed, a rejoinder affidavit too has been filed. Counsel appearing for the parties have been heard.

3. In the order of transfer dated 10.8.1988, there is a reference to Board's letter dated 20.5.1980, a copy of which has been produced by Shri Ramesh Darda and we have perused the same. According to this letter, an Inspector working within the jurisdiction of one Collectorate is not liable to be transferred to the jurisdiction of another Collectorate. It follows that the applicant on or before 10.8.1988 was not holding a transferable post. It is an admitted position that the applicant sought a voluntary transfer from the Collectorate of Bombay to the Collectorate of Nagpur. The circular dated 20.5.1980 recites that even <sup>if an</sup> Officer or an Employee is transferred on compassionate ground from the jurisdiction of one Collectorate to the jurisdiction of another collectorate the same may be permissible subject to certain conditions. One of the conditions enumerated is that the transferee will not be entitled to count service rendered by him in the former Collectorate for the purpose of seniority in the new charge. He will be treated as a new entrant of the Collectorate to which he is transferred and will be placed at the bottom of the list of the temporary employee of the concerned cadre in the new charge. Obviously, this condition is being enforced as against the applicant. There can be no getting away from the situation that if the condition is valid and enforceable the applicant has no <sup>legs</sup> ~~just ground~~ to stand upon and his grievance if any, has got to be rejected.

6

4. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant has stated that the said condition is void abinitio. No argument has been advanced in support of this contention. Even on merits we are satisfied that the contention is <sup>not</sup> sound. We have already stated earlier that the post which the applicant was holding at Bombay was not a transferable one and the situation has been created by the applicant himself by seeking a voluntary transfer on compassionate ground. There is no question of violation of article 14 of the constitution as it has not been shown to us and that the said condition has not been universally applied by the department.

5. We find no element of arbitrariness in the condition. But for the transfer which the applicant himself sought the question of the applicant being transferred to Nagpur would not have arisen. We also hold that the applicant is estopped from questioning the legality of the condition.

6. The applicant is not <sup>entitled</sup> ~~liable~~ to any relief. The application is rejected. There will be no order as to costs.

*U. Savara*  
(USHA SAVARA) 16.7.92  
M/A

*S. K. Dhaon*  
(S.K. DHAON)  
V/C

srl

(7)

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

R.P. NO. 198/92

IN O.A. NO. 461/92

Anil S. Wasnik

Applicant

V/s

Collector of Central Excise

Bombay-III & 2 ors.

Respondents

Coram: Hon.Shri Justice S K Dhaon, Vice Chairman

Hon.Shri M Y Priolkar, Member(A)

TRIBUNALS ORDER:

Dated: 11.12.92

(Per: S K Dhaon, Vice Chairman)


The order dated 16.7.1992 passed by us is the subject matter of this Review Application.

In our order we have given reasons as to why for the purpose of determining the seniority of the applicant the length of service rendered by him at Bombay cannot be taken into account at Nagpur. Assuming that the reasons given by us are faulty, that can be no ground for filing a review application. We are satisfied that our order does not suffer from any error apparent on the face of the record to review our decision in the context of Order 47 Rule 1 of Civil Procedure Code. Therefore, no ground exists for either reviewing or modifying our order.

We are disposing this application by adopting the process of circulation which is permissible under the rules.

The review application no. 198/92 is rejected.

  
(M Y Priolkar  
M(A))

  
( S K Dhaon)  
V.C.