

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 1096/93

~~Transferred Application No: 1096/93~~

DATE OF DECISION 20.12.93

Shri Surendra Prasad Petitioner

Shri M.A. Mahalle Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

The Secretary, Min. of Health Respondent
and Family Welfare, New Delhi
and others.

Shri A.I. Bhatkar Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Shri M.R. Kolhatkar, Member (A)

The Hon'ble ~~8XXXX~~ Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (B)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ? ✓
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ? X
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ? X
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ? X

M.R. Kolhatkar
(M.R. Kolhatkar)
Member (A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No.1096/93

Shri Surendra Prasad

... Applicant

V/s.

The Secretary (Estt. III)
Ministry of Health and Family
Welfare, Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi.

Director/ Dy. Director
Family Welfare Training and
Research Centre, 332, S.V.P.
Road, Bombay.

Shri N.K. Saxena,
Social Worker
Instructor, Family Welfare
Training and Research Centre
I.I.P.S. Compound,
Govandi Station Road,
Deonar, Bombay.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri M.R. Kolhatkar, Member (A)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Appearance:

Shri M.A. Mahalle, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri A.I. Bhatkar for
Shri M.I. Sethna, counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 20.12.93

{ Per Shri M.R. Kolhatkar, Member (A) }

This application has been filed on 4.10.93
and challenges the memorandum dated 13.1.93 against
which a representation was also made on 4.2.92.
The respondents have filed a reply and they have
urged the basic point of limitation. After hearing
the parties we are inclined to condone the delay
of a few months after allowing for 18 months from
the date of representation. The case is admitted.

...2...

: 2 :

We feel that we can dispose of this application by issue of a proper direction to respondent No.1. We dispose of the same by giving the following order.

ORDER

Respondent No.1 is directed to consider the representation of the applicant dated 4.2.92 at page 23 of the file and dispose of the same within two months from the date of receipt of this order by means of a speaking order. If the applicant is aggrieved by the order passed by Respondent No.1, it will be open to the applicant to approach this Tribunal within one month from the date of receipt of the order.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

M.R. Kolhatkar
(M.R. Kolhatkar)
Member (A)

NS

order/Judgment despatched
to Applicant/Respondent (s)
on 31/1/94

By

(3)

C.F.N. 111/94
for orders.
fixed on 31/1/94.

2
27/9

for Tribunal Date: 2/1/94
Applicant in person / by M. A. Mahalle
Advocate / Respondent by Mr. A. Bhatkar
Counsel. Board of Charges
The matter adjourned to 11/1/94
for order on CP 111/94

Dy. Registrar

11/1/94

Applicant by Shri Mahalle.
Respondents by Shri Bhatkar.
The only grievance of the
applicant is that his
representation has not been
decided within the time
provided by the order dt.
20/7/93. All that we ask
is that the respondents
should decide the representation
within 8 weeks from the
date of receipt of copy of
this order. With this
direction CP-111/94 is
disposed of.

11/1/94
order/Judgment despatched
to Applicant/Respondent (s)
on 28/4/94

28/4/94

(P. P. Srivastava) (M.A.)
(M.S. Deshpande)
V.C.