CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORDERS OF THE BENCH

Date of Order: 15.11.2011

O.A. No. 533/2011

Mr. P.N. Jatti, counsel for applicant.

Heard. O.A. is disposed of by a separate order on the separate sheets for the reasons recorded therein.

(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)
MEMBER (J)

Kumawat

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 533/2011

DATE OF ORDER: 15.11.2011

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Suresh Bahadur S/o Megh Bahadur, by caste Bahadur, aged about 23 years, R/o C-70, Bhagwan Das Road, Jaipur, presently working as Cook- Casual Labour Group 'D' in Guest House O/o the Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, NCR Building, Statue Circle, Jaipur.

...Applicant

Mr. P.N. Jatti, counsel for applicant.

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi.
2. Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, NCR Building, Statue Circle, Jaipur.

...Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

By way of the present Original Application, the applicant is praying that by a suitable writ, order or direction, the respondents be directed to act as per the representation dated 20.09.2011 (Annex. A/1).

2. From bare perusal of the pleadings as well as documents available on record, it reveals that the said representation dated 20.09.2011 (Annex. A/1) is still pending consideration before the respondents. Since the applicant is praying that the respondents be directed to consider the said representation, in view of this, I deem it proper to direct the respondents to consider the representation dated 20.09.2011 (Annex. A/1) and pass a

reasoned and speaking order and communicate the decision so taken on the said representation to the applicant.

3. Consequently, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation dated 20.09.2011 (Annex. A/1) by passing a reasoned and speaking order and to communicate the same to the applicant expeditiously but in any case not later than a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is further made clear that till the disposal of the said representation, the respondents are expected to maintain the status quo of the applicant as exists today.

4. However, the applicant is given liberty to redress his grievance by way of filing the substantive Original Application, if any prejudicial order against his interest is passed by the respondents.

5. With these observations and directions, the Original Application stands disposed of with no order as to costs.

(JUSTICE K.S. RATHORE)
MEMBER (J)

kumawat