

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.622/2017

Date of Decision: 13.10.2017.

CORAM: HON'BLE SHRI ARVIND J. ROHEE, MEMBER (J)

Babasaheb Kisan Bhosale
 Working as Head TTE, Pune
 R/at Flat No.201, Prathamesh
 Exotica, S.B. Patil School Road
 Ravit, Dist. Pune 412 101.
(Advocate Shri Vicky Nagrani)

... ***Applicant***

Versus

1. Union of India,
 Through the General Manager,
 Central Railway, CSTM,
 Mumbai 400 001.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager (P),
 Central Railway, Pune Division,
 Pune.

... ***Respondents***

ORDER (Oral)

Today Division Bench is not available.
 Hence taken up before Single Bench.

2. When the matter is called out for admission, heard Shri Vicky Nagrani, learned Advocate for the applicant. I have carefully perused the case record.

3. The Applicant is presently working as HTT (Head Travelling Ticket Examiner) at Pune. He has grievance regarding the impugned order dated 01.09.2017 (Annexure A-1) by which he is

transferred from Pune to Miraj in Sangali District in the same capacity on vigilance advice as mentioned in the remarks column thereof. The applicant has submitted a representation dated 12.09.2017 (Annexure A-6) followed by reminder dated 03.10.2017 (Annexure A-7) to the Respondent No.2 raising personal grounds and administrative grounds. However, according to him nothing has been heard from the other end so far. It is also submitted by the learned Advocate for the applicant that in pursuance of the impugned order of transfer, the applicant is still not relieved from present post. Obviously, he has not joined at the transferred station.

4. Considering above factual position, this Tribunal is of the considered view that ends of justice will be better served, if appropriate directions are issued to the respondents in the matter.

5. Respondent No.2 is, therefore, directed to consider and pass a reasoned and speaking order on the pending representation dated 12.09.2017 (Annexure A-6) and 03.10.2017 (Annexure A-7) of the applicant in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. The order so passed shall then be communicated to the applicant at the earliest, who will be at liberty to approach the appropriate forum in case his grievance still persists.

7. It is further directed that till a decision is taken by the Respondent No.2 on the pending representations, he shall be allowed to work on the present place, if not relieved earlier and if already relieved, the said relieving order shall remain in abeyance till decision is communicated to the applicant.

8. The OA stands disposed of with the above directions at the admission stage, without issuing notice to the respondents and without making any comments on merits of the case.

9. **DASTI.**

(A.J. Rohee)
Member (J)

dm.