

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH  
@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@

Commercial Complex (BDA),  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 1/9/87

APPLICATION NO 731/87(F) /~~xxx~~

~~xxxxxx~~

Applicant

Smt. Ahalya Bai Vs Director General (STN), P&T, ND.

To

1. Smt. Ahalya Bai,  
W/o Mr. H. Krishna Bhatta,  
No. 18, 'Kowshik'  
R.B.I. Colony, 3rd Block,  
Jayanagar,  
Bangalore-11.
2. Shri Stanley Lazerns,  
Advocate,  
32, Old Madras Road,  
Bangalore-8.

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ~~xxxx/xxxx~~ / ORDER  
~~xxxxxx/xxxx~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said  
application on 25-8-1987.

Encl : as above

*B. V. Venkataswamy*  
Deputy Registrar  
SECTION OFFICER  
(JUDICIAL)

RECEIVED (2) Copies 2/9/87  
02/09/87 Diary No. 1093/CR/87  
Date: 3/9/87

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman  
and  
Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan, Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 731/1987

Smt. Ahalya Bai,  
W/o Mr. H. Krishna Bhatta,  
No.18, 'Kowshik',  
R.B.I. Colony, 3rd Block,  
Jayanagar,  
Bangalore-11.

.... Applicant.

(Shri Stanley Lazerns, Advocate)

v.

The Director General (STN),  
Indian Post & Telegraphs Dept.,  
New Delhi.

.... Respondent

This application having come up for hearing to-day,  
Vice-Chairman made the following:

O R D E R

In this application made under Section 19 of the  
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1935 ('the Act'), the  
applicant has challenged order No. AP/14-22 dated  
21.1.1935/19.2.1935.

2. In I.A. No.1, the applicant has sought for con-  
dation of delay of 1 year and 345 days as has calculated  
by the office. But according to our calculation, there  
is a delay of one year and 112 days.

3. In her affidavit, in support of the I.A.No.1, the  
applicant states that her colleagues had told her that  
the period of limitation for making an application under

the Act was 3 years and therefore there is delay. We are of the view that this allegation is as vague as it could be. Even otherwise, this ground, even if it is true, which we very seriously doubt, does not constitute a sufficient ground for condoning the inordinate delay. On any view of the matter, the facts and circumstances stated by the applicant do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the inordinate delay. In this view, I.A. No.1 is rejected.

4. In the light of our above discussion, we reject I.A. No.1. As a consequence, we reject the main application without notices to the respondents.

Sd/-

Vice-Chairman *MS*

Sd/-

Member (A)

-True copy-

dms/Mrv.

*P. V. M. S. S. S. S. S.*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE  
119