

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH,**  
**JABALPUR**

**Original Application No. 592 of 2005**

Jabalpur, this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2005

Hon'ble Shri Madan Mohan, Judicial Member

Shri Vijay Kumar Bajpai, son of late  
Ram Narayan Bajpai, aged about 50 years,  
Resident of Anand Colony, Dewadora Post,  
District Mandla – 481661. .... Applicant

(By Advocate – Ku. P.L. Shrivastava)

**V e r s u s**

1. Union of India, through Ministry of Water  
Resources Department, Central Water Commission,  
Room No. 628, Seva Bhawan, R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi.
2. Chief Engineer, Central Water Commission,  
Seva Bhawan, R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi.
3. Superintendent Engineer, (Coordination)  
Central Water Commission, Narmada Basis  
Organisation, Block No. 3, Ground Floor,  
Paryawas Bhawan, Jail Road,  
Bhopal – 462011 (MP). .... Respondents

**O R D E R (Oral)**

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant.

2. By filing this Original Application the applicant has claimed the following main relief :

“(i) to quash the impugned order of transfer dated 15.6.2005 (Annexure A-6) passed by the respondent No. 1 in so far as applicant is concerned and to direct the respondents to continue the applicant at his present place of posting i.e. Aamgaon, and to pay him regular salary and allowance.”



3. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant is presently working as Junior Engineer under Narmada Controlling Authority. A list of 72 employees was prepared for transfer, vide office order dated 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2005 (Annexure A-6-a). In this list the name of the applicant was not included. But by subsequent order dated 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2005 (Annexure A-6) four employees whose names were included in the earlier list were exempted from transfer and two employees including the applicant were ordered to be transferred. In the transfer order (Annexure A-6) the exact place of transfer of the applicant is not mentioned. The applicant in this regard has moved a representation dated 24.6.2005 (Annexure A-7) to the Chief Engineer (HRM), and the same is still pending for consideration. The learned counsel for the applicant argued that she will feel satisfied if directions are issued to the respondents to consider and decide the said representation of the applicant dated 24.6.2005 (Annexure A-7) and till then the applicant be not disturbed from the present place of posting.

4. Thus, I feel that ends of justice would be met if I direct the respondents to consider and decide the said representation of the applicant dated 24.6.2005 (Annexure A-7) by passing a speaking detailed and reasoned order within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. I do so accordingly. Till the aforesaid representation of the applicant is decided, he shall not be disturbed from the present place of posting. The learned counsel for the applicant is directed to send a copy of this order as well as the copy of the petition to the respondents immediately.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the Original Application stands disposed of at the admission stage itself.



**(Madan Mohan)**  
**Judicial Member**