

29.1.90

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 72/90

P.C. ANNAMMA VS. DIVL. PERSONNEL OFFICER S.RLY AND OTHER

Shri Sarathkumar-
for applicant.

SPM & ND

List for admission, interim relief and condonation
of delay on 30th January, 1990.

by S.P.
29.1.90

SPM & ND

Mr. K.P. Haridas for applicant-

Mr. C.S. Ramanathan for cause for respondent-

30.1.90

The counsel for the applicant
is directed to give a copy of the
application to the learned counsel for
respondents. List for admission on
1.2.90.

by S.P.

30/1/90

1.2.90

SPM & ND

K.P. Haridas-for applicant.
CS Ramanathan-for SCGSC

List for further directions on admission and interim
relief and condonation of delay on 19th Feb. 1990.

by S.P.
1.2.90

NV/CD & ND

19/2/90

(5)

K.P. Haridas for applicant
G. Mathi Dandapani for respondent.

Respondents seek additional time to
file reply. The reply be filed within two weeks
with copy to applicant. The cause be listed
before a Bench on 12.3.90.

by S.P.
19/2/90

MVK & ND

12/3/90

(5)

Mrs K. P. Haridas for the applicant.

Mrs. Swapna Dadaspuri for the respondent.

Respondents seek for this time to file reply to the M.P. for condonation of delay. Last opportunity is given. Reply should be filed within one week.

Fix the case for hearing on

22/3/90

SD

MVK & ND

12/3/90

Mrs. K. P. Haridas for applicant by proxy
Miss Prachi Mr. Consul ~~for~~ for respondent.

22.3.90
(1)

Respondents have filed a counter to the M.P. regarding condonation of delay. The applicant seeks some more time in this regard. Time granted.
The case be listed for hearing on admission on 5.4.90

SD

22.3.90

NVK & ND

5/3/90
O

Mr K P Haridas for the applicant.

Mr. Sumathi Bandapani of the respondents

Replies filed
by applicant.

4.

At the request of counsel of applicant,

this matter is adjourned to 9/4/90.

5/3/90

NVK & ND

Mr KP Haridas for the applicant
Smt Sumathi Bandapani for the respondents.

The applicant has filed MP 64/90 seeking condonation of delay in filing the application to which the respondents have filed the reply opposing the condonation.

2 We have heard the counsel. It is seen that there is a delay of 442 days. The applicant was working as a casual labourer and given the temporary status on 23.10.78 and superannuated on 31.1.87 and this application should have been filed long back. It is stated that the matter had been entrusted to a Trade Union representative and hence the applicant could not pursue the matter properly.

3 We see from the reply filed by the respondents that no representations were received by them and in view of the circumstances we find that adequate reasons have not been given to explain the long delay in filing this application.

4 This application is therefore, rejected at the admission stage itself.

9.4.90

Final orders
communicated
on 11-4-90.