

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**O.A. No.2854/2019**

Monday, this the 24<sup>th</sup> day of September 2019

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)**

Jui Deogaokar, Age 36 years,  
Occupation: Performer & Arts Management Consultant,  
D/o Sadashiv Shantaram Deogaokar,  
R/o 603, Perfect Apartment,  
Sheela Vihar Colony,  
Paud Phata, Kothrud,  
Pune-411038, Maharashtra - Applicant

(By Advocate: Ms. Neela Gokhale)

Versus

1. Union of India,  
Through Ministry of External Affairs,  
Government of India,  
Foreign Secretary,  
172 South Block,  
Janpath, Delhi-110001
2. Indian Council for Cultural Relations,  
An Autonomous body of the Govt. of India,  
Through its Director General,  
Azad Bhawan, Indraprastha Estates,  
New Delhi-110002
3. Mrs. Narinder Chauhan,  
Ambassador, Embassy of India (Prague)  
Milady Horakove 60/93  
17000 Praha 7, Czech Republic,  
(Through Ministry of External Affairs)  
Government of India,  
Foreign Secretary
4. Mr. Sanjiv Aggarwal,  
Counsellor & Head of the Chancery Embassy of India  
(Prague), Milady Horakove 60/93,  
17000 Praha 7, Czech Republic  
(Through Ministry of External Affairs)  
Government of India,  
Foreign Secretary - Respondents

## **O R D E R (O R A L)**

This Original Application (OA) has been filed by the applicants seeking the following reliefs:-

- “A. That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to stay the Relieving Order dated 21.06.2019 issued to the Applicant by the Respondents.
- B. That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to reinstate the Applicant at her position of Director, ICC at the Indian Embassy in Prague or provide her with any other equivalent appointment for such period that she has been deprived from work; or
- C. That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to provide appropriate remuneration for the duration for which the Applicant has been relieved even after subsistence of her tenure;
- D. That this Hon’ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass any other order and/or direction as it may deem fit, proper and necessary in the interest of justice.”

2. When the matter is taken up, counsel for the applicant draws our attention to the several representations filed by her on 19.03.2019, 20.05.2019, 11.06.2019 and 13.06.2019 placed at Annexure A-16, 17, 18 and 19 respectively, but no proof of service is provided even in the single representation of the applicant. Hence, as per Section 20 of the AT Act, 1985, the applicant shall first file the representation to the respondents and after giving respondents six months’ time to reply to the same, then only can she file the OA in the CAT with proof of submission of such representation to the respondents.

3. With the above directions, the OA is dismissed as premature at the admission stage itself.

**(Nita Chowdhury)**  
**Member (A)**

/lg/