

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 1015/95

DATE OF DECISION: 6/1/2000

Shri V.N.Masurkar _____ Applicant.

Shri S.P.Kulkarni _____ Advocate for
Applicant.

Versus

Union of India & 2 Ors. _____ Respondents.

Shri S.S.Karkera for _____ Advocate for
Shri P.M.Pradhan _____ Respondents.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri B.N.Bahadur, Member(A).

Hon'ble Shri S.L.Jain, Member(J).

1. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
2. Whether it needs to be circulated to
other Benches of the Tribunal?
3. Library.

]
No

B.N.Bahadur

(B.N.BAHADUR)
MEMBER(A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:1015/95
DATED THE 6TH DAY OF JANUARY,2000

CORAM:HON'BLE SHRI B.N.BAHADUR, MEMBER(A)
HON'BLE SHRI S.L.JAIN, MEMBER(J)

1. Shri Vasant Narayan Masurkar,
Casual Labour(Postman),
at Thane East Post Office,
Thane - 400 603. Applicant
And One another.

By Advocate Shri S.P.Kulkarni.

1. Union of India
Through:
Senior Superintendent of Post
Offices,
Thane Central Division,
Thane- 400 601.

2. Postmaster General,
Bombay Region, O/O.C.P.M.G.,
Maharashtra Circle,
Old G.P.O.Bldg,
2nd Floor, Near V.T., Bombay - 1.

3. Chief Postmaster General,
Maharashtra Circle, Old G.P.O.
Building, 2ND fLOOR, Near V.T.
Bombay - 400 001. Respondents.

By Advocate Shri S.S.Karkera for
Shri P.M.Pradhan.

(ORDER) (ORAL)

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

Learned counsel for Applicant Shri S.P.Kulkarni and Shri
S.S.Karkera for Shri P.M.Pradhan, Counsel for Respondents are
present before us and have been heard.

At the outset, Counsel for Applicant fairly states that
as regards Applicant No.2, i.e. Shri D.D.Khade, *he was* declared
successful and has been provided the relief that was sought.
Learned Counsel for Respondents, Shri S.S.Karkera substantiated
this by submission of order dated 19/8/96. Hence, the
application in so far as Applicant No.2 is concerned has become
infructuous and is disposed of accordingly.

B.N.B

In regard to applicant No.1, i.e. Shri V.N.Masurkar, learned Counsel for Applicant fairly states that having appeared in the examination, it is learnt that he did not succeed. This is confirmed by Counsel for Respondents. Also, that the said Shri Masurkar was removed from service/discontinued from service for other cause which is not before us. The application for the remedy sought does not survive and is ~~also~~ dismissed.

Applicant No.1 would, needless to say, be at liberty to agitate the cause of his discontinuation if he is aggrieved and if so advised, ^{issue} ~~not~~ since this was not at all before us. There will be no orders as to costs.

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

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