

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

198

Ex. Acc. No.

DATE OF DECISION 16.9.1992

Shri A.K. Giripunje Petitioner

Shri A.S. Bhagat Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Sr. Supdt. of P.O. & 2 Others. Respondent

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

Vice Chairman.

(3)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, CAMP : NAGPUR.

O.A.861/92.

Shri A.K. Giripunje,
R/o. Indira Nagar,
Tumsar at Post Tq.Tumsar,
Dist. Bhandara.

.. Applicant.

Vs.

1. The Senior Supdt. of Post Offices
Mofussil Division,
Nagpur - 440012.
2. The Director Postal Services,
Nagpur - 440 010.
3. Union of India, through
Secretary to the Govt.
Ministry of Communication/
Chairman, Postal Services Board,
Dept. of Posts, New Delhi-1.

.. Respondents.

Coram : Hon'ble Shri Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman.
Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A).

Appearance:

Shri A.S. Bhagat, Counsel
for the applicant.

ORAL JUDGMENT :

Date : 16.9.1992.

¶ Per : Hon'ble Shri S.K. Dhaon, Vice Chairman ¶

The order dated 30.12.1991 passed by the Sr.
Supdt. of Post Offices is being impugned in the present
application.

2. It appears that during the pendency of the
application the appeal preferred by the applicant before
the Director Postal Services has been dismissed on 14.7.1992.
- ✓ It appears from the perusal of the application that a
revision application has been preferred by the applicant on
1.4.1992. However, that revision application has now
been to be ignored as the same was preferred before the
appellate order was passed. Now, it is open to the applicant
to prefer ^asecond revision application challenging therein
the original order as confirmed by the appellate order. If

O.A.861/92.

the applicant files the revision application, the revisional authority shall dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible but not beyond ~~one~~ a period of 4 months from the date of the receipt of the revision application alongwith the certified copy of this order.

3. In view of the fact that the applicant has a statutory right of ~~the~~ revision we do not consider ^{it} ~~a fit~~ ^{for} case ~~is~~ interference at this case.

4. With these directions the application is disposed of finally.

5. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A).

(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN.

ham/-.