

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.550/1995.

Wednesday, this the 10th day of January, 2001.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri B.N.Bahadur, Member (A),
Hon'ble Shri S.L.Jain, Member (J).

Lalit Mohan Bhargava,
Railway Quarters No.RB II/353-B,
Bungalow-side, Daund,
Dist. Pune.
(By Advocate Shri R.D.Deharia)

... Applicant.

Vs.

1. Union of India through
The General Manager,
Central Railway,
Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Office,
Central Railway,
Solapur - 413 001.
3. Shri M.R.Deshmukh, App. Mechanic,
4. Shri S.S.Varma, App. Mechanic,
5. Shri J.D.Patel, App. Mechanic,
6. Shri M.M.Saraph, App. Mechanic,
7. Shri P.K.Jawade, App. Mechanic,
8. Shri Biplab Hor, App. Mechanic,
C/o.Senior Divisional Mechanical
Engineer (Diesel),
Diesel Loco Shed, Central Railway,
Ghorpadi, Pune,
Maharashtra State.
9. Shri Shayam Lal Laxxman Master,
Electrical Chargeman,
Loco Shed, Central Rly.
Daund,
Dist. Solapur,
Maharashtra State.
(By Advocate Shri V.S.Masurkar)

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

{Per Shri B.N.Bahadur, Member (A)}

We have heard the Learned Counsels Shri R.D.Deharia for
the Applicant and Shri V.S.Masurkar for the Respondents.

2. From the facts of the case, it seems that the matter has
now become infructuous. The facts, which are in a short compass,



...2.

are as below.

3. The Applicant was working as a Chargeman in the Grade of Rs.1400-2300 in an ad-hoc capacity from 8.8.1989. He approached this Tribunal with this OA in 1995. However, admittedly, when a selection was conducted for regular selections in the appropriate quota, the applicant could not qualify in the selection. Those who were duly selected were appointed and were sent for training. In the reply statement it has been stated that ad-hoc candidates will be reverted when regular candidates are available. It is admitted today, that the applicant was reverted some time in the year 1996 when regular candidates became available.

4. At one point, the Learned Counsel Shri Deharia did contradict the statement of the Respondents that applicant had appeared and did not qualify in the selection. He said that the applicant had in fact not appeared. In the first place he could not prove this point through any document etc. Even otherwise, it would not make any material difference to the case, in the facts and circumstances of the case.

5. In the above circumstances, it is clear that the matter has become infructuous and is therefore dismissed with no orders as to costs.

S.L. Jain
(S.L.JAIN)
MEMBER(J)

B.N. Bahadur
(B.N.BAHADUR) ..
MEMBER (A)

B.