

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
BANGALORE - 560 030.

Dated: 3 MAY 1995

APPLICATION NO. 1257 of 1995.

APPLICANTS: Mr. N. Mohan Das,

V/S.

RESPONDENTS: The Director General, Stqc Dte, Electronics Niketen,  
New Delhi and two others.

To

1. Sri. G. S. Kannur, Advocate,  
No. 10/7/1, Kumaragrupe Road,  
High Grounds, Bangalore-1.

Subject:- Forwarding copies of the Orders passed by the  
Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore-38.

---xxx---

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the Order/  
Stay Order/Interim Order, passed by this Tribunal in the above  
mentioned application(s) on 18-04-1995.

Issued on  
3/5/95

*[Signature]*  
03/5/95  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

O.A. NO.1257/95

TUESDAY THIS THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF APRIL 1995

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman

Shri T.V. Ramanan ... Member [A]

N. Mohan Das,  
C-28, Gokula Colony,  
Bangalore-560 054.

... Applicant

[By Advocate Shri G.S. Kannur]

v.

1. The Director General, Stqc Dte,  
Electronics Niketan,  
No.6, CGO Complex,  
Iodhi Road,  
New Delhi-3.
2. The Director, ETDC, Keonics Bhavan,  
Ring Road,  
Peenya Industrial Estate,  
Bangalore.
3. S. Desikamani,  
The Director,  
EDTC, Keonics Bhavan,  
Ring Road,  
Peenya Industrial Estate,  
Bangalore-560058.

... Respondents

O R D E R

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:

1. Heard Shri G.S. Kannur, learned counsel for the applicant regards admission.. This is a case of a simple order of transfer. The applicant is transferred from Bangalore to Goa and he complains about it. The applicant says that the Government sent him abroad for higher training and was engaged in commissioning a new plant at Bangalore after return from higher training abroad. It is stated that at such a crucial



- 2 -

stage the applicant has been transferred to Goa. Whether he should have been transferred at a stage when his services are required at Bangalore is a matter for the Government and apropos the same we cannot speculate. We, therefore, find no merit in this application and dismiss the same.

2. At this stage counsel for the applicant seeks leave to withdraw this application so that the applicant can represent before the departmental authorities. We grant him leave to withdraw this application and instead of dismissing the application we allow the applicant to withdraw this application which will nevertheless stands dismissed. The applicant will, of course, be at liberty to represent against the transfer to the departmental authorities.

Sd/-

MEMBER [A]

Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN



TRUE COPY

*[Signature]*  
103/15/95  
Section Officer  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Bangalore Bench  
Bangalore