

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 210/00640/2016

Dated this Wednesday, the 12th day of June, 2019

CORAM: DR. BHAGWAN SAHAI, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)
SHRI R.N.SINGH, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

1. Miss Chaitali Shudhakar Tirlotkar,
residing at – Post Sasawane,
Taluka – Alibag, District – Raigarh.
 2. Miss Kirti Pradip Patil,
residing at – Post Sasawane,
Taluka – Alibag, District – Raigarh.
 3. Amol Gopinath Thakur,
residing at – wadgaon Post Veshavi,
Taluka – Alibag, District – Raigarh.
 4. Akshay Manohar Worlikar,
residing at – 40/G, Madkar House,
Shri Ram Lane, Worli Koliwada, P.M.G.,
Worli Colony, Mumbai – 400 030.
 5. Mrunal Kisa Burwane,
residing at – 62/D, Hajira Usman Chawl,
Golfadevi Road, Near Damodar Seva Mandal,
Worli Koliwada, Worli Colony,
Mumbai – 400 030.
- ... Applicants
- (None)

VERSUS

1. Union of India, The Secretary,
Integrated Headquarters (Navy),
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi 110 011.
2. The Chief of the Naval Staff,
The Integrated Headquarters (Navy),
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi 110 011.
3. The Admiral Superintendent,
Naval Dockyard,
Shahid Bhagat Singh Road,
Mumbai 400 023.

4. The Flag Officer Commanding in Chief,
Head Quarters, Western Naval Command,
Shahid Bhagat Singh Road,
Mumbai 400 001.

... Respondents

(By Advocate Ms. Ruju R. Thakker proxy counsel
for Shri A.M.Sethna)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Per: R.N.Singh, Member (Judicial)

None is present on behalf of the applicant.

2. Ms. Ruju R. Thakker, learned proxy counsel for Shri A.M.Sethna, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. It was found that reply affidavit was filed on behalf of the respondents way back on 24.04.2018. However, since then no rejoinder has been filed by the applicants. Moreover, it is apparent from the previous orders that there is no representation on behalf of the applicant on 25.07.2018, 01.10.2018, 04.12.2018, 17.01.2019, 18.02.2019 and 26.03.2019. Even on 16.01.2017, 01.03.2017, 25.04.2017, 11.07.2017, 14.09.2017, 09.11.2017, 01.01.2018 and 07.03.2018 also there was no representation on behalf of the applicants.

4. It appears that the applicants have lost interest in pursuing the matter.

5. Accordingly, the OA is dismissed for default as well as for non-prosecution.

(R.N.Singh)
Member (Judicial)
kmg*

(Dr. Bhagwan Sahai)
Member (Administrative)