

**REGISTERED**

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

TRIBUNAL

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

Dated : 7-7-87

APPLICATION NO 129 /86 ( F )

W.P. NO

**Applicant**

Shri R. Kshetrapals

V/s The Director of Postal Services  
Karnataka & another

T<sub>0</sub>

1. Shri R. Kshetrapala  
Retired Postal Assistant  
Postal Colony  
Hassan
2. Shri M. Madhusudhan  
Advocate  
1074-1075, Banashankari I Stage  
Sreenivasa Nagar II Phase  
Bangalore - 560 050
3. The Director of Postal Services  
Karnataka Circle  
Karnataka
4. The Superintendent of Post Offices  
Hassan Division  
Hassan
5. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao  
Addl Central Govt. Stng Counsel  
High Court Buildings  
Bangalore - 560 001

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~STAY~~/

~~INTERIM ORDER~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said

application on **1-7-87** .

Encl : as above

~~SECTION OFFICER  
(JUDICIAL)~~

9c,

Received from  
Dr. D. S. Marchal  
7-187

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JULY, 1987

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

APPLICATION NO. 129/1987

R. Kshetrapala,  
Retd. Postal Assistant,  
Postal Colony,  
HASSAN.

.... Applicant.

(Shri M. Madhusudhan, Advocate)

v.

1. Director of Postal Services,  
Karnataka Circle,  
Karnataka.
2. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Hassan Division,  
Hassan.

(Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, CGSC)

This application having come up for hearing on  
I.A. No.1, Vice-Chairman made the following.

ORDER ON I.A. 1 - APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY.

In this application made under Section 21(3) of the  
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('Act'), the applicant  
has sought for condoning the delay of more than 1½ years  
in presenting the original application under Section 19  
of the Act. Among others the applicant has asserted that  
he was not aware of the legal provisions and therefore  
the delay be condoned.

2. I.A. No.1 is opposed by the respondents.



3. Shri M. Raghavendrachar, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that all the facts and circumstances pleaded in I.A. No.1 constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay.

4. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned Additional Central Government Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, contends that all the facts and circumstances pleaded by the applicant do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay.

5. The one and the only ground pleaded by the applicant is that he was not aware of the legal provisions made to redress his grievances under the Act. We are of the view that this statement hardly constitutes a ground, much less a sufficient ground, to condone delay. Even otherwise, everyone of the facts and circumstances stated by the applicant, besides being vague and general, do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the inordinate delay of more than 1½ years. We see no merit in the application. We therefore reject I.A. No.1. As a consequence of this we reject Application No. 129/87 without examining the merits. But in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



sd - - -

sd - - -

Vice-Chairman 11/11/87

Member (A) 11/11/87