

***CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.771 OF 2017

Dated this the 24th day of January, 2018

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

Shri Houshala Prasad Mishra,
 Hindu Indian adult Inhabitant,
 working as a Driver in the category of MLD
 Gr.II under AFO/ Engg/W/Shop/Pl,
 Engineering Department,
 BCT Division of the Western Railways,
 falling under the Ministry of Railways
 at present residing at Railways Staff Quarters No.44/A,
 at Dadar Junction,
 Near to Station Master (Yard Office),
 Mumbai 400 028.

- Applicant

(By Advocate Shri M.Sahu)

Versus

1. Union of India,
 through the General Manager,
 Western Railways, Churchgate,
 Mumbai 400 023.
2. The Divisional Railways Manager,
 Western Railways, Mumbai Central,
 Mumbai 400 008.
3. The Estate Officer and Senior Divisional Engineer
 (Estate / South) Western Railways,
 Mumbai Central,
 (representing Divisional Railways Manager),
 Mumbai 400 008.
4. The Assistant Personnel Officer,
 (representing Divisional Railways Manager),
 Western Railways Administration,
 Mumbai Central,
 Mumbai 400 008.

- Respondents.

O R D E R (ORAL)

Today when the matter is called out for admission, the applicant and Shri M.Sahu, learned Advocate for him both remained absent without any intimation, even on repeated calls and although waited up to 03:30 P.M.

2. In this OA, the applicant has grievance regarding recovery of amount towards rent (licence fees) and charging of penal rent in respect of Railways Staff Quarter bearing No.99/1, which according to him has been improperly allotted.

3. The record shows that this OA has been filed on 25.04.2016. The office on scrutiny has published as many as five office objections. The learned Advocate for the applicant vide communication dated 06.07.2017 was informed to remove the office objections. However, nothing has been heard from other end so far. In view of this, Registry has placed this matter before this Tribunal for admission.

4. However, considering the fact that

the applicant and his Advocate remained absent without any intimation nor the matter got circulated, the OA cannot proceed further.

5. In view of this, the OA stands dismissed in default of appearance of applicant and his Advocate and also for failing to remove the office objections.

6. Registry is directed to forward copy of this order to both the parties at the earliest.

(Arvind J. Rohee)
Member (Judicial)

*kmg**