

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH

O.A.No.....184..... of 97

DATE OF DECISION.....28.1.00.....

Sri Narayan Sarma

PETITIONER(S)

Mr. M.Chanda.

ADVOCATE FOR THE
PETITIONER(S)

-VERSUS-

Union of India & Ors.

RESPONDENT(S)

Mr. A.Deb Roy, Sr. C.G.S.C.

ADVOCATE FOR THE
RESPONDENT(S)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
GUWAHATI BENCH

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.N.BARUAH, VICE-CHAIRMAN.
O.A.No..... of

THE HON'BLE

DATE OF DECISION.....

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
 3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?
 4. Whether the Judgment is to be circulated to the other Benches ?
- Judgment delivered by Hon'ble Vice-Chairman.

ADVOCATE FOR THE

RESPONDENT(S)

ADVOCATE FOR THE
RESPONDENT(S)

THE HON'BLE

THE HON'BLE

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

Whether the Judgment is to be circulated to the other Benches

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GUWAHATI BENCH

Original Application No. 184 of 1997.

Date of decision : This the 28th day of January, 2000.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D.N. Baruah, Vice-Chairman.

Sri Narayan Sarma
Son of late Nandi Kishore Sarma
Village-Naubil Pathar,
P.O. Nepali Basti,
District-Sonitpur (Assam)

..Applicant

By Advocate Mr. M. Chanda.

-versus-

i. Union of India,
through Secretary to the Govt.
of India, Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.

ii. The Commanding Officer/Station Adjutant,
825 Signals Unit AF,
C/o 99 APO.

...Respondents.

By Advocate Mr. A. Deb Roy, Sr. C.G.S.C.

O R D E R

BARUAH J.(V.C.).

This application has been filed by the applicant seeking certain directions to the respondents. The case of the applicant is that he had been working as casual worker on being appointed in the office of the Commanding Officer No. 21(A), Communication System Installation Unit at Tezpur. He was working for the period from 1981-1990, Thereafter he was disengaged from service. Later on some vacancies arose and the applicant submitted representation praying inter alia for his regular absorption. The said representation of the applicant has not yet been disposed of. Hence the present application.

2. Heard Mr. M. Chanda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant and Mr. A. Deb Roy, learned Sr. C.G.S.C.

Contd..

3. Mr. Chanda submits that the applicant is entitled to the benefit of the scheme as per the decision of this Tribunal in the case of Rajkamal Vs. U.O.I.(O.A. No. 2306/89) reported in 1990 (2) SLJ CAT 169.

4. On hearing the counsel for the parties I feel that the respondents should have disposed of the representation. As the representation has not yet been disposed of I dispose of this application with direction to the respondents to dispose of the Annexures-6 and 7 representations by a reasoned order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order. While considering the case of the applicant the respondents shall follow the decision of this Tribunal in the case of Rajkamal Vs. U.O.I (Supra).

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I, however make no order as to costs.


Vice-Chairman

trd