

Per Tribunal

fixed for A.H.
on 2.3.95

MS/95/2
1.3.95

for Dy. Registrar

Dated: 2.3.95

Sl. No 6

Shri H. Y. Deo, counsel for the
applicant. Shri K. P. Anilkumar, counsel
for the respondents.

Respondents are directed to file
reply within two weeks. List the case
on 20.3.95 for admission hearing.

DAST.

MR Kolhatkar

(M. R. Kolhatkar)
m (A)



(B.S. Hegde)

M (S)

21/3/95
order/Judgement despatched
to Applicant/Respondent(s)
on 21/3/95


21/3/95

Dated: 20.3.95 Sl. No. 13

Shri H. Y. Deo for the applicant.
Shri Anil Kumar for the respondents.
Counsel heard. Respondents have
filed their reply. Since no orders of
termination have yet been passed, we
only direct that if the orders of
termination passed, they shall not
be given effect for a period of
four weeks from the service of that
order. liberty to the applicants
to approach the Tribunal within that
period for appropriate orders.

In the meanwhile, in view of
the statement made by the respondent
counsel that after the end of present
project, the applicants if found
suitable will be considered for

Contd.

Contd.

employment should any project come up where the services of the applicants can be utilised. The applicants will have liberty to have their claims considered for employment in such other project and we direct the respondents to consider the applicants for appointment if they found suitable.

With these directions, the OA is disposed of.

V.P.L

Officer in Charge
(P.P. Srivastava) (H.S. Deshpande)
m.j. M(A) M/C

Mr. 203/95

~~Order/Indemnity (disputed)~~
to ~~Mr. 203/95~~
Mr. 203/95

2/1/95

c.p.n. 65/95
sent to order
on 2/1/95

2/1/95

M.P.N. 409/95
Filed for ^{making} directions
to be
2/6/95

P.F.O.

C.P. No. 65/95
fixed hearing
on 21/6/95

28

2/6/95

M.P.No 409/95
Ruled for ~~no~~ directions
to resp.

21/6/95

Dated: 2.6.95

Mr. H.Y. Deo, counsel for the applicant. An interim order was passed on 20.3.95 directing the respondents to hold in abeyance the operation of the order for a period of four weeks. The order passed by the respondents on 3.4.95, Annexure A.7 to CP No.65/95 the applicants are paid salary for four weeks in compliance to the order passed by the Tribunal as no work was available. Considering the position we see no merit in the Contempt Petition and it is dismissed.

M.P.No.409/95 has been filed as part of the C.P. No. 65/95 for an injunction restraining the respondents from giving effect to the advertisement no. 2/95 which was issued in the 'Sakal' dated 25.3.95. The O.A. has been disposed of finally by the order dated 20.3.95 and since we are not taking any action on the C.P. no order/direction as sought in M.P. No. 409/95 can be passed.

2.6.95
Order/Judgement despatched
to applicant/respondent(s)

~~21/6/95~~

22.6.95 V.A/d

Liberty to the applicant to pursue any other remedy if ~~permissible~~ ^{is permitted} ~~they~~ ^{if} otherwise they feel aggrieved ~~in respect of~~ ^{by} the advertisement issued.

M.P. disposed of with this liberty.

(P.P.Srivastava)
Member(A)

(M.S.Deshpande)
Vice Chairman

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, BOMBAY

(4)

R.P.NO. 89/95
in
C.P.NO. 65/95
in
OA.NO. 246/95

Mrs.A.K.Deshpande & Anr. ... Applicants

V/S.

Union of India & Ors. ... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Vice Chairman Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande
Hon'ble Member (A) Shri P.P.Srivastava

Tribunal's Order by Circulation
(PER: P.P.Srivastava, Member (A))

Dated: 25.9.95

This Review Petition is for reviewing our orders in Contempt Petition No. 65/95. The Contempt Petition was disposed of by the Tribunal by its order dated 2.6.1995 and the contempt petition was dismissed on merit. In the review petition the petitioners have brought out that the respondents have failed to issue separate orders of termination and therefore it is clear violation of the order dated 20.3.1995 disposing of the OA.No.246/95. The petitioners have also brought out that the applicants never received four weeks salary at the time of the termination of their services, i.e. on 3rd April, 1995.

2. In this review petition the petitioners have not brought out any error in the judgement on the face of the records nor they have brought out any new material which would warrant any review of our orders. The arguments which have been brought out in the review petition were already considered before passing the order in the contempt petition and therefore we see no reason to review the order already passed in the contempt petition. The review petition, therefore, is accordingly dismissed.


(P.P.SRIVASTAVA)
MEMBER (A)


(M.S.DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN