

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. NO: 768/92

199

~~XXXXXX NO:~~

DATE OF DECISION 16.9.92

R L Rahangdale

Petitioner

Mr. A S Mardikar

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

G.M. Ord. Factory

Respondent

Mr. R. Darda

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 ?

No

Y.C.

mbm\*

TRK

(2)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH CIRCUIT SITTING AT NAGPUR  
NAGPUR

OA NO. 768/92

Ratiram Laxman Rahangdale  
Civil Lines  
Gondia ..Applicant  
C/o. A S Mardikar  
Advocate; 5 Canal Road;  
Ramdaspeth Nagpur.

V/s.

General Manager  
Ordnance Factory  
Bhandara ..Respondent

Coram: Hon. Shri Justice S K Dhaon, V.C.  
Hon. Shri M Y Priolkar, Member(A)

APPEARANCE:

Mr. A S Mardikar  
Counsel  
for the applicant

Mr. R. Darda  
Counsel  
for the respondents

ORAL JUDGMENT:  
(Per; S K Dhaon, Vice Chairman)

DATED: 16.9.92

On 20.3.1985 an order was passed removing the applicant from service. That order ~~it appears~~ becomes final. The applicant made representations that the order of removal may be converted into one of voluntary retirement. Having failed to get any redress, he has approached this Tribunal by means of this application under Section 19 of the Act.

The applicant had served in Army for three years and thereafter he joined the Ordnance Factory. Even if the services rendered by him in the Army are taken into account, ~~the~~ <sup>of</sup> total number of years/ service would not exceed fourteen. The applicant should possess

minimum 20 years qualifying service before invoking the rule of voluntary retirement. Therefore, in no case, could the applicant be given a voluntary retirement. The applicant's representation, therefore, was clearly misconceived. We are not in a position to grant any relief.

Shri Darda, who appears on behalf of the respondents, has been heard.

The application is rejected summarily.

  
( M Y Priolkar )  
Member(A)

  
( S K Dhaen )  
Vice Chairman

trk