

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No. 198/95  
Transfer Application No.

Date of Decision : 2.6.95

V.M. Pendum

Petitioner

Mr.S.S.Karkera

Advocate for the  
Petitioners

Versus

U.O.I. & Ors.

Respondents

Mr. S.C.Dhawan


Advocate for the  
respondents

C O R A M :

The Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Shri P.P.Srivastava, Member(A)

- (1) To be referred to the Reporter or not ? *M.*
- (2) Whether it needs to be circulated to  
other Benches of the Tribunal? *M.*

  
Vice Chairman

(3)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH, 'GULESTAN' BUILDING NO.6  
PRESCOT ROAD, BOMBAY 1

O.A.NO. 198/95

Vishnu Mahadeo Pendam

..Applicant

V/s

Union of India & 2 ors.

..Respondents

Coram: Hon.Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, V.C.  
Hon.Shri P.P.Srivastava, Member(A)

Appearance:

Mr.S.S.Karkera for Mr. M.S.Karnik

Counsel for the applicant

Mr. S.C.Dhawan

Counsel for the respondents

ORAL JUDGMENT:


DATED: 2.6.95


(Per: M.S.Deshpande, Vice Chairman)

Heard the counsel. It is apparent that the applicant has not produced the ITI certificate which has been prescribed but has produced ITES certificate which according to him is equivalent to ITI certificate. The counsel for the respondents submits that the equivalence has to be decided by the Department. In respect of two instances which have been cited in para 4, the respondent's counsel states that Yogesh Naik is working as Khalashi and not as Electrical Fitter on the basis of ITES certificate, while there is no such employee as Vilas Bhosale with the respondents.

2. In the circumstances, we see no merit in the application. It is dismissed.

3. In view of this the M.P. for condonation of delay is also disposed of.

  
(P.P.Srivastava)  
Member(A)

  
(M.S.Deshpande)  
Vice Chairman