

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 189/92

~~Transfer Application No~~

DATE OF DECISION 15.3.93

Smt. Madhavi Sanjay Joshi Petitioner

Shri Y.R. Singh Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others Respondent


Shri R.C. Kotiankar Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble ~~Shri~~ Ms. Usha Savara, Member (A)

The Hon'ble Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member (J)

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 ?
- } uo.


(V.D. DESHMUKH)
MEMBER (J)

NS/

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

(3)

Original Application No. 189/93

Smt. Madhavi Sanjay Joshi

... Applicant.

V/s

Union of India through
Chief General Manager,
MTNL, 2nd floor, GPO Building
Fort, Bombay - 400 001.

Accounts Officer, Traffic I
MTNL, Bombay V.S. Marg
Telephone House, Dadar
Bombay.

... Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Ms. Usha Savara, Member (A)

Hon'ble Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member (J)

Appearance:

Shri Y.R. Singh, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri R.C. Kotiankar, counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 15.3.93

{ Per Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member (J) }

The applicant joined the service of the respondent No.2 as temporary Mazdoor . As she ~~was~~ performed the superior work of typist , she was given compensation from 1.10.90. She was regularised in service with effect from 1.1.1992. It appears that an amount of Rs. 500/- per month was being deducted from 1.12.1992 as has been shown on the salary slip (annex. 'C' to the application). Applicant, therefore made a representation on 18.1.1993, but before any decision by the respondents on that representation she ~~has~~ filed the present application.


We heard the learned counsels for the applicant and also the respondents. The application is ~~based~~ ^{opposed} on the ground that it is premature as the representation was given by the applicant on 18.1.93 and ^{before} the period of six months ~~has not~~ expired the applicant has approached this Tribunal. In the circumstances we find that the application can be


29

disposed of with the directions to the respondents to decide the representation within a specified ^{time} on merits with a speaking order. Hence the respondents are directed to hear the applicant and decide her representation dated 18.1.93 within eight weeks from today with a speaking order. The respondents shall also consider the request of the applicant for interim relief by way of stopping the recoveries. If the applicant ~~is~~ still has ^{any} grievance after the representation is decided, it shall be always open to the applicant to approach this Tribunal. The application is disposed of with the above directions.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Copy of this order shall be given to the counsel for the applicant as expeditiously as possible.


(V.D. DESHMUKH)
MEMBER (J)


(USHA SAVARA)
MEMBER (A)

NS/