

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560 038.

Review Appln No. 17 of 1994

Dated:-22 JUL 1994

APPLICATION NUMBER: 854 of 1993.

APPLICANTS:

RESPONDENTS:

Sh. N.V.S. Prasad Sarma vs. Divisional Railway Manager
I.O. S.C. Railway, Hubli.

① Sri. N.V.S. Prasad Sarma,
Railway Sectional Officer,
Co. Station Superintendent,
Hubli Railway Station,
HUBLI-580029.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the
Central administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ~~ORDER/~~
~~STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/~~, passed by this Tribunal in the above
mentioned application(s) on 11-07-94.

Issued on
22/7/94
R

of

for *E. Shanmugam*
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 17/1994 IN
854/1993

MONDAY THIS ELEVENTH DAY OF JULY, 1994

MR. JUSTICE P.K. SHYAMSUNDAR VICE CHAIRMAN

MR. T.V. RAMANAN MEMBER(A)

Shri N.V.S. Prasada Sarma
Aged 49 years,
Railway Sectional Officer
C/o Station Superintendent/
Hubli Railway Station,
Hubli - 580029

Applicant

(Party in person)

v.

The Divisional Railway Manager,
S.C. Railway,
Hubli

Respondent

O R D E R

MR. JUSTICE P.K. SHYAMSUNDAR, VICE CHAIRMAN

Heard the applicant in person. The position is ^{with} not different from what we conceived of while disposing of O.A.No.854/93 dated 3.2.94 where the claim was for payment of taxi fare for journeys rendered while performing official duty by the applicant. We have pointed out in the O.A. referred to supra how the applicant is not entitled to taxi fare. The position remains as it was even now although the applicant claims that in terms of some orders of the Railway Board, he is entitled to taxi fare. The applicant has not produced before us any such order in support of his claim. On the other hand, as



pointed out by us, the applicant who was drawing a salary of Rs.2000/- and odd was ineligible for taxi fare in accordance with the Railway Board's circular. We, therefore, see nothing wrong in the action of the Department in rejecting the claim of the applicant for taxi fare. The application, therefore, stands rejected. We also reiterate our earlier order in O.A.No.854/93.



Sch
MEMBER (A)

Sch
VICE CHAIRMAN

TRUE COPY

S. S. Shauhar
27/7
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE