

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 612/92

199

T.A. NO:

DATE OF DECISION 2 -7-92

Shri Sunil Kerba Pingale Petitioner

Shri G.Waskar Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India Respondent

Shri A.I.Bhatkar. Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. U.Savara, Member(A)

The Hon'ble Mr. J.P.Sharma, Member(J)

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 ?

J.P.Sharma
(J.P.Sharma)
Member(J) 21/7/92

mbm*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH
BOMBAY

Original Application 612/92

Shri Sunil Keraba Pingale .. Applicant

vs

1. Union of India
Udyog Mantralay
Delhi.

2. Director,
Small Industries Services
Institute, Kurla
Andheri Road,
Saki Naka, Bombay-400-072

3. Assistant Director
Bombay ..

Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Ms. U. Savara, Member(A)
Hon'ble Mr. J. P. Sharma, Member(J)

Appearance:

Shri G. Waskar for
the applicant.

Shri A. I. Bhatkar for the
respondent.

Judgment

Dated: 2 -7-92

(Per: Hon'ble Mr. J. P. Sharma, Member(J)

oral

~~the application submitted~~

The applicant has come to this Tribunal
against the order dated 12-5-92 by which he was informed
that his services will be ceased with effect from 28-5-1992.
The applicant in this application has claimed relief
that the said order dated 12-5-92 though wrongly written
as 12-2-1992 in the relief (a) below para 7 and further
he has also claimed pay and allowances which he was
getting before the date of termination. This application
was filed on 16-6-92. The learned counsel for the
respondent during the course of hearing produced a
photo copy of the order dated 29-6-92 with a copy
to the learned counsel for the applicant. That the order
dated 12-5-92 impugned by the applicant in the above
original application has since been withdrawn and quashed
by the administration. The query was put to the learned

counsel for the applicant whether he is satisfied with this order passed by the respondent. The learned counsel for the applicant desired that the services of the applicant be regularised immediately and dues if any be paid to him.

As regards the regularisation we do not think it proper to pass any order because the applicant has already declared as a surplus staff. As regards the payment of his dues emoluments for the period he has worked the respondent shall pay his salary and other allowances which he was drawing before the date of his termination, i.e. 28-5-92.

The application is therefore disposed of accordingly.

J.P.Sharma

(J.P.Sharma)
Member(J)

U.Savara

(Ms. U.Savara)
Member(A)

27.92