

(2021) 02 CAT CK 0149

In the Central Administrative Tribunal

Case No : Petition For Transfer Application No. 100, 185 Of 2020

Surendra Narayana Singh & Others

APPELLANT

Vs

Shaik Bajeeth & Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-02-2021

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2021) 02 CAT CK 0149

Hon'ble Judges : L. Narasimha Reddy, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : K.Siva Reddy, R.V. Sinha, Vijendra Singh

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

L. Narasimha Reddy, J

1. The respondents 4 and 5 in the OA.No.748 of 2020 on the file of the Hyderabad Bench of this Tribunal, filed this PT with a prayer to transfer the same to the Principal Bench.

2. The applicants herein contend that the first respondent filed the OA.No.748/2020, claiming certain reliefs and impleaded them as respondents. It is stated that the applicants herein are residents of Gurugram and Delhi respectively, and they cannot be required to face litigation at Hyderabad.

3. The respondent no.1 filed a counter affidavit. It is stated that before O.A.No.748 of 2020 was filed, he filed another OA before the Hyderabad Bench, claiming certain reliefs and it is only in compliance with the order passed therein that the impugned order, which is challenged in OA.No.748 of 2020, is passed. He states that the 4th respondent, who is the concerned authority, is from Secunderabad and that no prejudice would be caused to the petitioners herein, in case the OA is heard and disposed of by the Hyderabad Bench.

4. We heard Shri K.Siva Reddy, learned counsel for the Applicants and Shri R.V.Sinha and Shri Vijendra Singh, learned counsel for the Respondents.

5. It is no doubt true that the applicants are residents of Gurugram and Delhi respectively, and it would be difficult for them to face the proceedings at Hyderabad Bench. The fact, however, remains that the respondents herein are conferred with the right to institute the proceedings before the bench under whose jurisdiction it falls. In these days of virtually hearing of the OAs, it would not cause much difficulty for the applicants. They can contest the matter by engaging an Advocate from whatever place they chose.
6. The balance of convenience is in favour of the first respondent to pursue the proceedings before the Hyderabad Bench.
7. Therefore, the PT is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.