

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 307/2017

Date of Decision: 13th June, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE Dr. MRUTYUNJAY SARANGI, MEMBER (A)

Smt Bharati Vandan Garud
Working as Enforcement Officer,
Mumbai III,
Residing at Adarsh Society A 2011,
2nd Floor, Naigaon Dadar (E)
Mumbai - 400 014.

... **Applicant**

(By Advocate Shri Vicky Nagrani)

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through Secretary,
Ministry of Labour,
Bhavishya Nidhi Bhavan,
14, Bhikaiji Cama Place,
New Delhi - 110 006.

2. The Central PF Commissioner,
Employees of P.F. Organization,
Bhavishya Nidhi Bhavan,
14, Bhikaiji Cama Place,
New Delhi - 110 006.

3. The Regional PF Commissioner-
Mumbai III, Kandivali Regional Office,
Bhavishya Nidhi Bhavan,
Plot No.222 Sector No.3,
Charkop Market Charkop Poisar Road,
Kandivali (W),
Mumbai - 400 067. ... **Respondents**

(By Advocate Shri R.R. Shetty)

ORDER (ORAL)

Per: Dr. Mrutyunjay Sarangi, Member (A)

The applicant has filed the present O.A. praying for the following reliefs:-

"8(a) This Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to call for the records of the case from the respondents and after examining the same be pleased to direct the respondents to consider and accept her withdrawal of VRS application dated 13.04.2017 and further direct the respondents to allow her to continue on her post of Enforcement Officer/Account Officer with all consequential benefits.

(b) Costs of the application be provided for.

(c) Any other and further order as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit in the nature and circumstances of the case be passed."

2. When the matter was taken up today, Shri R.R. Shetty, learned counsel for the respondents produced a letter in the Court dated 29.05.2017 enclosing a communication from the Employees' Provident Fund Organisation to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-I, Regional Office, Mumbai-II, Kandivali conveying the approval of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner for acceptance of withdrawal of Voluntary Retirement Notice in respect of the applicant.

3. Shri Vicky Nagrani, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant's grievance

has been met and there is no further need to continue with the OA and therefore the applicant wants to withdraw the OA.

4. In view of the above, the Original Application is disposed of as *infuctuous*. No order as to costs.

(Dr. Mrutyunjay Sarangi)
Member (A)

ma.