

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

ST.82/92

O.A. NO: 844/92

199

~~T.A. NO:~~

DATE OF DECISION 17.7.1992

S.KESAVALU

Petitioner

MS.NEELAM SARIN

Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Divisional Rly. Manager,
SE, Railway, Nagpur and ors.

Respondent

Shri P.S.Lambat.

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble ~~Mr.~~ USHA SAVARA, 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 ?

N2

(S.K.DHAON)
V/c

mbm*

(2)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH
CAMP AT NAGPUR

ST.NO.82/92

O.A.No. 844/92

Shri S.Keshvalu,
Occ.Service, resident
of S.E.Railway,
Qrts.No.171/8, Motibagh,
Nagpur.

.... Applicant

V/s

1. Divisional Railway Manager,
South Eastern Railway,
Nagpur.
2. Senior Medical Supdt.
Polyclinic of South-Eastern
Railway, Motibagh, Nagpur

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman
HON'BLE USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (A)

Appearance :

Ms.N.B.Sarin, Adv.
for the applicant.

Shri P.S.Lambat, Adv.nts.
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

17th JUL 1992


(PER : JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, Vice-Chairman)

By an order dated 1st July 1992 passed by the Divisional Personnel Officer, the applicant a Pharmacist Grade-III, has been transferred from Nagpur to Nagbhid. The said order is being impugned in the present application. The order recites that the same has been passed on the Administrative grounds. We, therefore, feels that the proper remedy of the applicant is to to make a representation to the Divisional Railway Manager, South - Eastern Railway, Nagpur. If, such a representation is made within a period of one week,

The officer concerned shall dispose off the same on merit, ^{and} in accordance with the law as expeditiously as possible. However, the impugned order or transfer shall not be given effect to as against the applicant till the representation is disposed off.

2. We have heard Ms. Neelam Sarin, advocate for the applicant. Shri P.S.Lambat, counsel for the respondents has accepted notice on behalf of the respondents and he has been heard in opposition to this application.

3. With these directions this application is disposed off finally. There will be no order as to costs.


(USHA SAVARA)
M/A


(S.K.DHAON)
V/C

srl