

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

FORM OF INDEX AS PER CAT (DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS) RULES, 1990

LIST OF PAPERS IN OA/TA/RA/CP NO. 187/86 /

Sl.No.	Items	Description of papers
1.	2.	3.
1.	Order sheets	Kept
2.	All orders/judgements of the Tribunal passed in the case	do
3.	Judgements and orders received from the Supreme Court in the case.	Not Received
4.	All applications including MAs/Plaints/memoranda/appeals together with annexures and all other documents whether original or copies filed with them	Destroyed
5.	Counter/written statement and reply affidavits	do
6.	All depositions of witnesses taken by way of affidavit	do
7.	All documents or certified copies received by the Court and marked as exhibits, reports and examination of commissioners.	do
8.	Notices	do
9.	Letters filed by the counsel and other correspondences, vakalatnama/memo of appearance	do
10.	All other papers not already specified.	do

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE
TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH,
BANGALORE**

ORDER SHEET
Application No 187 of 1987(F)

Applicant
K. Ramesh
Advocate for Applicant

Sh. H. R. Narayan

Respondent
Chief Commissioner of Income Tax
(Adm.) Bangalore & off.
Advocate for Respondent

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
13-3-87.	<p>This application filed u/s 19 of the Act is praying to:-</p> <p>Direct R-1 to dispose of the Applicant's appeal relating to engagement of a Legal Practitioner to issue such other order/directs as deemed fit.</p> <p><u>Interim Relief</u>:- to stay D.E. Proceedings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— x —</p> <p>As directed by the Registrar, application is registered and is being placed before the Bench for admission on 13-3-87.</p> <p>I/O removed.</p> <p>13/3/87</p>	<p>Applicant by Mr. RAS.</p> <p>Debar</p> <p>Order on the interim prayer made by the applicant.</p> <p>Before my questions raised in this case are decided, it is not proper that the inquiry against the applicant begin with no 4 should be continued. The interim order showing remedy not to proceed with the inquiry, besides being in the interests of justice, will not occasion any injury and loss to the resps. We therefore stay the further proceedings against the applicant before the bench for a</p>

110

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
	<p>order of 13-3-87 commu- nicated & Respt No 4 and Notice issued to all Respondents on 13³/₈₇ with Hg on 27-3-87</p> <p>13/3</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> 27/3/87</p> <p>27-3-87 Before KSPJ - VC PS - MCA)</p> <p>Dr. Applicant present in person.</p> <p>Dr. M.S. Padmanabhaiah for R.</p> <p>Application dismissed order dictated</p> <p>Boo <i>[Signature]</i> CO Eth</p>	<p>for a period of 14 days from the day of reply to the NRTS Call on 27-3-1987</p> <p>for confirmation of ^{and order} otherwise of Ex parte stay of ^{order} order</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> 13/3/87</p> <p>13-3-87</p>

3
**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE -
TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH,
BANGALORE**

187/87CF

Order Sheet (contd)

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
21-4-87	order dt. 27-3-87 issued to all the parties concerned V/C added to the file. TRB	

Date

Office Notes

Orders of Tribunal

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 27TH MARCH, 1987.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy,

Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr. P. Srinivasan,

Member(A).

APPLICATION NUMBER 187 OF 1987.

K. Ramanna,
Aged 39 Years,
Son of Sri Kenchappa,
No. 223, II Phase,
11th 'B' Cross, 18th Main,
J.P. Nagar, Bangalore-78.

Applicant.

v.

1. The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax
(Admin.) Karnataka-I, Bangalore.
2. The Commissioner of Income Tax-I,
Karnataka-II, Bangalore.
3. The Inspecting Assistant Commissioner
of Income Tax, Range-III, Bangalore.
4. The Inquiry Officer,
Camp Bangalore, South Zone.

Respondents.

(By Sri M.S. Padmarajaiah, CGSSC).

--

This application coming on for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

Case called. Sri K. Ramanna, applicant present. His counsel Shri M.R. Narayan is not present. But, the applicant submits that his case be taken up for hearing and disposed without waiting for the presence of his learned counsel. We have therefore, taken up this application for hearing.

2. In this application made under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant had sought for two directions (1)

to the respondents to furnish him certified copies of 'listed documents' and (2) to respondent No.1 to dispose of his appeal dealing with the permission to engage a legal practitioner in the disciplinary proceeding instituted against him.

3. At the hearing to-day the applicant files a memo stating that he has been furnished with all the 'listed documents' and that his appeal dealing with the permission to engage a legal practitioner had also been disposed of by respondent No.1 permitting him to engage a defence assistant. In that memo, he has however, sought to keep open the question relating to engaging a legal practitioner which also, he does not press at the hearing.

4. In his memo and at the hearing, the applicant prays for award of exemplary costs. Shri M.S.Padmarajaiah, learned Central Government Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents opposes the award of costs.

5. We have examined the claim of the applicant for award of costs. We find no justification to award either exemplary or ordinary costs sought by the applicant.

6. What emerges from the above is that all the reliefs sought by the applicant have already been granted by the authorities themselves and therefore, this application no longer survives for consideration. We, therefore, dismiss this application as having become unnecessary. But, in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.


VICE-CHAIRMAN


MEMBER(A)

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

APPLICATION No. 187/87(F)

(WP.NO.)

COMMERCIAL COMPLEX, (BDA)
INDIRANAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 038.

DATED: **15 APR 1987**

APPLICANT

Vs

RESPONDENTS

Shri K. Ramanna

The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax
Bangalore and 3 Ors

TO

1. Shri K. Ramanna
No. 223, II Phase
11th 'B' Cross, 18th Main
J.P. Nagar
Bangalore - 560 078
2. The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Admin)
Karnataka - I
Bangalore
3. The Commissioner of Income Tax
Karnataka II, Bangalore
4. The Inspecting Asst. Commissioner of Income Tax
Range - III, Bangalore
5. The Inquiry Officer (South Zone)
Income Tax Room No. 103
I Floor, Income Tax New Annex Building
121, Nungambakam High Road
Madras - 600 034
6. Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah
Senior Central Govt. Stng Counsel, High Court Buildings, Bangalore - 560 001

SUBJECT: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE
BENCH IN APPLICATION NO. 187/87(F)

....

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on

27-3-87

ENCL: As above.

KN

B.V. Venkatesh Reddy
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

Shri S., please issue order.
MS

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 27TH MARCH, 1987.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy,

Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr. P. Srinivasan,

Member(A).

APPLICATION NUMBER 187 OF 1987.

K. Ramanna,
Aged 39 Years,
Son of Sri Kenchappa,
No. 223, II Phase,
11th 'B' Cross, 18th Main,
J.P. Nagar, Bangalore-78.

Applicant.

v.

1. The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax
(Admin.) Karnataka-I, Bangalore.
2. The Commissioner of Income Tax-I,
Karnataka-II, Bangalore.
3. The Inspecting Assistant Commissioner
of Income Tax, Range-III, Bangalore.
4. The Inquiry Officer,
Camp Bangalore, South Zone.

Respondents.

(By Sri M.S. Padmarajaiah, CGSSC).

--

This application coming on for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

Case called. Sri K. Ramanna, applicant present. His counsel Shri M.R. Narayan is not present. But, the applicant submits that his case be taken up for hearing and disposed without waiting for the presence of his learned counsel. We have therefore, taken up this application for hearing.

2. In this application made under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant had sought for two directions (1)



to the respondents to furnish him certified copies of 'listed documents' and (2) to respondent No.1 to dispose of his appeal dealing with the permission to engage a legal practitioner in the disciplinary proceeding instituted against him.

3. At the hearing to-day the applicant files a memo stating that he has been furnished with all the 'listed documents' and that his appeal dealing with the permission to engage a legal practitioner had also been disposed of by respondent No.1 permitting him to engage a defence assistant. In that memo, he has however, sought to keep open the question relating to engaging a legal practitioner which also, he does not press at the hearing.

4. In his memo and at the hearing, the applicant prays for award of exemplary costs. Shri M.S.Padmarajaiah, learned Central Government Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents opposes the award of costs.

5. We have examined the claim of the applicant for award of costs. We find no justification to award either exemplary or ordinary costs sought by the applicant.

6. What emerges from the above is that all the reliefs sought by the applicant have already been granted by the authorities themselves and therefore, this application no longer survives for consideration. We, therefore, dismiss this application as having become unnecessary. But, in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



Sd _____

Sd _____

VICE-CHAMAN

MEMBER(A)

True Copy -

B. V. Venkatesh Reddy
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE

27/3/87