

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5593 of 2019**

- A.M. Jury S/o Shri K.M. Jury Aged About 59 Years Posted As Assistant Inspector General, Police Headquarter, Project And Planning, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. 492008

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Union of India Through The Secretary, Department of Personnel and Training, North Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi, Delhi 110001.
2. Chairman Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, 61, 35, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi, Delhi. 110001.
3. Deputy Registrar, Central Administrative Tribunal, Caravs Complex, 15, Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh 482001.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri A.V. Shridhar, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri B. Gopa Kumar, Assistant Solicitor General.

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge****Order on Board****Per P.R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****30.07.2019**

1. The grievance of the Petitioner is mainly with regard to the delay on the part of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur Bench in finalizing the matter forming the subject matter of O.A. No. 931 of 2017, despite the fact that the final hearing is already over and the matter has been taken up for judgment on 01.02.2019.
2. Heard Shri A.V. Shridhar, the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Shri B. Gopa Kumar, the learned Assistant Solicitor General for Union of India.

3. The prayers raised in the O.A. are in the following terms:

“8.1 That, this Hon'ble Tribunal may kindly be pleased to set-aside the order dated 03.08.2017 (Annexure A/1).

8.2 That, this Hon'ble Tribunal may further kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to grant all consequential benefits flowing from quashing of impugned order dated 03.08.2017 (Annexure A/1).

8.3 That, any other relief/order which may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case including award of the costs of the petition may be given.”

4. The learned counsel submits that the matter was finally heard, but the delay in passing the verdict has quite detrimentally affected the rights and interest of the Petitioner and hence the writ petition.
5. After hearing both the sides, this Court does not find it necessary to go through the merits of the case. If the final hearing is already over it will only be appropriate, if the verdict is pronounced by the Tribunal, without delay; more so in view of Rule 105 of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Rules of Practice, 1993.
6. Accordingly, this writ petition disposed off expressing the earnest hope and desire that the matter would be finalized by the Tribunal at the earliest.

Sd/-

(P. R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge