;	CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
	Stamp No
	Regiscration No. O.A./T.A
	Name of Applicant: General manager worky.
ž	Signature
1,•	No. of Respondents in excess of five
2.	Process fees taxed
•	
3.	Intimation given in person/by letter on
4 .	Process fees paid on 902 729797 B: 1001— 15/4/95 by D.D./P.O. 713 560652 B 201— 15/4/95 864 692580 B: 501—

5. Notice Issued on



Office Notice, Office
Memorandum, of coram
Appearance, Tribunal's
Orders of direction &
Registrar's Orders.

Tribunal's Orders

Per Tribunal
Fixed For AH IZE
on 20/8/93.

Paymon Shivadhandes Dy Registrar

OA'.NO. 732/93

Dated: 20.8.93

Shri M.S.Ramamurthy with Shri P. R.Pai for the applicant. Shri G.K. Masand for the respondents.

Respondents have filed their reply. Rejoinder, if any, within two weeks.

To be heard on admission on 10.9.93.

(MS. USHA SAVARA)

(M.S.DESHPANDE)

V . L

OA 732/93

Dated: 10.9.93

Shri M.S. Ramamurthy, with Mr. P.R. Pai, counsel for the applicant. Shri G.K.Masnad, counsel for the respondents.

It is stated by Shri Ramamurthy and also confirmed by Shri Pai and Shri Dhawan that in an idential matter regarding the Central Railway employees a stay of the operation of the order of the Labour Court has been passed and the matter has been passed on the sine-die list.

List the case for hearing on admission on 12.11.93. The mission of the order is mayer his the significant of the significant of

(Lakshmi Swaminathan) (M.Y.Priolkar)

Member(J) Member(A)

<u>NS</u>

order/Judgement despatehed to Applicably Respondent (1) on ______

Paran

order/Judgement despatched
to Applicant/Respondent (s)
on 25-11-95

Dated: 12-11-93.

Mr. Ramesh Ramanurthy for me. Mr. S. Ramamurthy for the applicant. Mr. H. D. Rajani for Mr. G. K. Masard for the respondents.

Mr. Rajani prays for an adjournment as Mr. Masard is not well.

Adjourned to 10.12.93.

Interm relief already

granted will continue till then.

(Lakshmi Swaminathen) (M.4+molker) M(7) M(A)

2.12

1. O.A. No.682/93.

2. O.A. No.732/93 ×

3. O.A. No.733/93.

4. O.A. No.734/93.

Tribunal's Order:

(3)

Dated: 10.12.1993

Shri Ramamurthy, counsel for the applicant and Shri G.K.Masand, counsel for the Respondents. There is a delay of about a month in filing the present application. But Shri Ramamurthy makes an oral application stating that this was due to the administrative delays arising out because of the matters had to be considered at different levels by the Government. Shri Masand for the Respondents states that the formality of having a written application with reasons may not be insisted upon if the Court is inclined to grant condonation of delay, as regards to reasons given by Shri Ramamurthy. We condone the delay in filing the application.

- 2. Admit. Shri Ramamurthy prays for an interim stay, considering the circumstances of the case, We are not inclined to grant interim stay of the payment. No interim stay except that the payment shall be made to the employee directly through the departmental agencies and not through the advocate. The payment will be subject to the final out come of the application.
- 3. Shri Masand takes notice. Reply within six weeks. Rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter. The matter to appear before the Registrar for completion of pleadings on 11.2.1994 and then on the sine die list.

(M.R.KOLHATKAR)

MR & that kow

.R.KULHATKAR) MEMBER(A) (M.S.DESHPANDE) VICE-CHAIRMAN

Office Notice, Office Memorandum, of coram Appearance, Tribunal's Orders of direction & Registrar's Orders.

Tribunal's Orders

Per Tribunal
Fixed For AH IZE
on 20/8/93.

Paymon Shivadhandes Dy Registrar

OA.NO. 732/93

Dated: 20.8.93-

Shri M.S.Ramamurthy with Shri P. R.Pai for the applicant. Shri G.K. Masand for the respondents.

Respondents have filed their reply. Rejoinder, if any, within two weeks.

To be heard on admission on 10.9.93.

(MS. USHA SAVARA) M (A)

(M.S.DESHPANDE

OA 732/93

Dated: 10.9.93

Shri M.S. Ramamurthy, with Mr. P.R. Pai, counsel for the applicant. Shri G.K.Masnad, counsel for the respondents.

It is stated by Shri Ramamurthy and also confirmed by Shri Pai and Shri Dhawan that in an idential matter regarding the Central Railway employees a stay of the operation of the order of the Labour Court has been passed and the matter has been passed on the sine-die list.

List the case for hearing on admission on 12.11.93. The military of the order is played his the sure of the sure o

(Lakshmi Swaminathan) (M.Y.Priolkar)

Member(J) Member(A)

<u>NS</u>

De las

order/Judgement despatched
to Applicant/Respondent (s)
on 15-11-95

Dated: 12-11-93.

Mr. Ramesh Ramamurthy for Mr. Mr. Ramamurthy for the applicant. Mr. H. D. Rajani for Mr. G. K. Masand for the respondents.

Me. Rajani prays for an adjournment as Me. Masard is not well.

Adjourned to 10.12.93.

Interm relief already

granted will continue till then.

(dakshmi (waminatten) (M.4+molker) M(7) M(A)

212

order/Liment despatched to App espondent (s) on 21-12-93

24-12

Dated: 11-2-1994.

None for either side.
Reply for opposing admission of R-1 to Home is an record.

5.0. to 15-4-19 940 for reply (detailed) is any or a lost chance

Registar

Datel: 15-4-1994.

None for either side.

Detailed septy not
yet fied. De core be
semitted in sine-die
fish Al-the time of
fixif the date of
be issued to Coursel
for both the sides.

Dy. kgishar

Per Tribunal Of 18/12/95

The matter is taken out from Sine - die list. hix be had hear jam 20:296. Issue holice to the parties.

Decha Cofficer.

Qi.

Notices in ad to Applicate Law Law Law Control 411196

Per Iribunal Date: Myl e oplicant in person by Mr. Ms Ravanus orate / Respondent by Mr. General for want of fine The matter adjourned to 3/7/96 for Soul Ling.

Dy. Registrar

Date: 3.7.96 Per Tribunal As there will be no Division Bench, the mott - fixed on before the Tribunal is adjourned tot Admission hearing / directions orders / final hearing on 29.10.96

Inform the advocates / Parties accordingly.

Dy. Registrar

29/10/96-25

Heard Mrs. Shyamli Hojela for 8hi M.S. Ramamurthy for Applicant and Shi G.K. Masard fier Respondents. As this matter pertains to Industrial Toibunal, thes Moibural does net have jurisdictions to entertain the same. In the circumstances, OA is dismissed for weart of jewisdiction. Applicant is permitted to appeal to the Industrial of orbural. Mediletic

NAL

Order/Judgement despatched to Applicant ampresent (s)

31/10/94 11/1/6/6.

alplm. R. Kolhatkan)

(B-8. Hegde)