

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,

MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 283/1997.

Thursday, this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1997.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri B.S.Hegde, Member(J).

S.S.Patil,  
Bhadole Hatkamangale,  
District - Kolhapur.

... Applicant.

(By Advocate Shri S.P.Kulkarni)

V/s.

Union of India through  
Telecom District Manager,  
Telephone Bhawan,  
Tarabai Park,  
Kolhapur - 416 003.

... Respondents.

(By Advocate Shri S.S.Karkera)

O R D E R (ORAL)

{Per Shri B.S.Hegde, Member(J)}


Heard Shri S.P.Kulkarni, counsel for the applicant and Shri S.S.Karkera, counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant is challenging the order passed by the C.G.I.T. No.2, Mumbai dt. 18.4.1996 before this Tribunal under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act. During the course of hearing the learned counsel for the respondents drew my attention to a decision of the Supreme Court in Ajay D.Panalkar V/s. Management of Pune Telecom Department(Arising out of S.L.P.(C) No.22525/96) wherein the Apex Court has held that the Central Administrative Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the application filed by the respondent Management and set aside the order of the Tribunal. In view of this position, the application cannot be

...2.

*B.S.H.*

entertained and the same is disposed of accordingly  
with liberty to the applicant to approach the  
appropriate forum. No order as to costs.

  
(B.S. HEGDE)  
MEMBER (J)

B.