

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)

2/7/92

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  
Bomay

..

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 applicant has come to this Tribunal~~  
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 That the order dated 12-5-92 impugned by the applicant in the above original application has since been withdrawn and quashed by the administration.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

3

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*  
2.7.92  
(Ms. U.Savara)  
Member(A)