

(9)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,

BOMBAY BENCH, CAMP AT NAGPUR.

Original Application No.530/92.

Shri K.U.Wath.

.....Applicant.

V/s.

Union of India & Ors.

.....Respondents.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, Vice-Chairman,

Appearances:-

Applicant present in person.
Respondents by Shri M.G.Bhangade.

Oral Judgment:-


[Per Shri M.S.Deshpande, Vice-Chairman] Dt. 30.7.1993

Heard the applicant who is present in person and Shri M.G.Bhangade, learned counsel for the Respondents.

2. The main contentions of the applicant are that Officer the Reporting/and the Appellate Authority had malice against him, that his representations were not decided within time nor were the appeals decided promptly, that no speaking orders had been passed by any of the departmental authorities upon his representations.

3. It is apparent that the communication conveying the adverse remarks was sufficiently detailed and specific. The memorandum dt. 28.5.1992 states certain details the reasons why the representations of the applicant was not being accepted. It is difficult to see what more could be said on the applicant's representation. The applicant's right to approach the Tribunal would arise from procedural irregularities in the matter of consideration of his representations and in the matter of communicating adverse remarks.

Suffice it to say that in the present case the remarks were specific and detail^{ed} and the representations were considered by passing a speaking order. No interference is called for. The application is dismissed.


(M. S. DESHPANDE)
VICE-CHAIRMAN

B.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
BOMBAY BENCH.

Review Petition No.123/93

IN

Original Application No.530/92.

Shri K.U.Wath.

.... Applicant.

V/s.

Union of India & Ors.

.... Respondents.

ORDER ON REVIEW PETITION NO.123/93

Tribunal's Order :-

Dated: 13.12.1993.

[Per Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande,Vice-Chairman]

This review application is in respect of the order passed on 30.7.1993 in O.A. No.530/92 rejecting the applicant's challenge to the adverse confidential remarks communicated to him and the rejection of his representation. No new grounds have been raised in the application which could not have been raised at the time when the applicant was heard in support of the Original Application. The applicant's grievance is that the order was wrong, but that apprehension cannot be a ground for review. The application for review is therefore dismissed.


(M.S.DESHPANDE)
VICE-CHAIRMAN.

B.