

## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 667/92  
~~Ex No.~~

198

DATE OF DECISION 31.7.92

Shri Stephan Lakra Petitioner

Shri S.K. Pathmdu Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and ors. Respondent

Shri R.K. Bhetty. 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?

ND

*S.K.Dhaon*  
(S.K.DHAON)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

(3)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 667/92

Shri Stephen Lakra

... Applicant

V/s.

Union of India and others.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A)

Appearance:

Shri S.K. Pathmdu, advocate  
for the applicant.

Shri R.K. Shetty, counsel  
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 31.7.92

{ Per Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman }

The applicant has been transferred from  
Bombay to Bolangir <sup>the order of transfer</sup> has been impugned <sup>in</sup> by the present  
application.

Under our direction, an affidavit has  
been filed by Smt. Indu Liberhan, Additional  
Controller General of Defence Accounts, New Delhi.  
We have gone through the said affidavit and we are  
satisfied that the order of transfer has been passed  
on relevant consideration. The affidavit has made  
out a case that the applicant has been transferred  
in public interest. We, therefore, <sup>do</sup> not consider it  
a fit case for interference.

Learned counsel for the applicant vehemently  
urged that we should direct the respondents to grant  
leave to the applicant. This is not in our province.  
It is open to the applicant to make an application  
to the proper authority. If this is done, we have

By no doubt that the application <sup>will</sup> ~~can~~ be disposed off  
By on <sup>the</sup> merits of the case.

The application deserves to be rejected. <sup>It is,</sup>  
Therefore, rejected.

  
(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)  
MEMBER(A)

  
(S.K. DHAON)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH  
-----

Review Petition No.141/92 in  
Original Application No.667/92

Shri Stephen Lakra

... Applicant

V/s

Union of India and others

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member (A)

Tribunal's order on Review Petition by circulation.

Dated: 28-9-92


¶ Per Shri S.K.Dhaon, Vice Chairman ¶

This is an application seeking a review of our order dated 31.7.92, whereby we had rejected the original application No.667/92.

The original application was directed against an order of transfer. We declined to interfere, and we had made it clear that it was open to the applicant to make a representation to the proper authority. We had also directed that the representation, if made, will be disposed of in accordance with law.

We have gone through the Review Petition carefully and we are not able to discern any error much less an apparent error on the face of the record in the order passed by us and which is sought to be reviewed. We, therefore, find no substance in this application and we are disposing of the same by adopting the process of circulation as permissible under the Rules.

The Review Petition No.141/92 is rejected.

  
(M.Y.PRIOLKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

  
(S.K.DHAON)  
VICE CHAIRMAN

NS/