

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

DATE OF ORDER: 19.04.2004

OA No. 505/2002

with

MA Nos. 565/2002 & 450/2003

1.

1. Rohit Bajaj son of Shri Jetha Nand Bajaj, 4 to 16, Jawahar Nagar, Jaipur.
2. Mahandra Saxena son of Shri J.P. Saxena, C/o 51/156, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur.
3. Smt. Anjula Soni wife of Shri Vijay Soni, 2614, Moti Singh Bhomio Ka Rasta, Johri Bazar, Jaipur.
4. Madhu Pareek wife of Shri Ashok Pareek, 4781 Matka, K-J-B Ka Rasta, Johri Bazar, Jaipur.
5. Ramavtar Jhalani, son of Shri Birdhi Chand Jhalani, 65/114, Pratap Nagar, Sanganer, Jaipur.
6. Kuldeep Singh aged 40 years, son of Shri Raghu Nath Singh, resident of Boraj House, Kishanpole Bazar, Jaipur.
7. Ms. Purnima Sharma aged 35 years daughter of Shri Nand Lal Ji Sharma, E-21, Gokhle Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur.

Applicants

VERSUS

1. The Union of India through the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Prasar Bharti, Bhartiya Prasaran Nigam, Doordarshan Kendra, Mandi House, New Delhi.
3. The Director, Doordarshan Kendra, Jhalana Doongari, Jaipur
4. Shri Sanjay Dutt Mathur
5. ~~Shri Raj Kishore Saxena~~
6. ~~Shri Manoj Tiwari~~
7. Shri Pawan Sethi
8. Shri Vasudev Sharma

All Private respondents are working as Production Assistant at Doordarshan Kendra Jaipur and Service through Director, Doordarshan Kendra, Jhalana Doongari, Jaipur.

Respondents

Dr

Mr. Rajendra Vaish, Counsel for the applicants.

Mr. Tej Prakash Sharma, Counsel for the respondents nos. 1 to 3.

Mr. Saugath Roy, Counsel for the respondents nos. 4 to 8.

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. M.L. Chauhan, Member (Judicial)


Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bhandari, Member (Administrative)

ORDER (ORAL)

The learned counsel for the applicant submits that he wants to withdraw this OA at this stage with a liberty ~~to~~ reserved to him to file a substantive OA regarding seniority. Permission granted subject to just exceptions. The OA stands dismissed as withdrawn.

2. Accordingly, in MAs nos. 565/2002 and 450/2003, no order is required to be passed in view of the order passed in the OA and the same too are dismissed.


(A.K. BHANDARI)
MEMBER (A)


(M.L. CHAUHAN)
MEMBER (J)