

REGISTERED

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

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

Dated : 7-7-87

APPLICATION NO 129 /87(F)

W.P. NO

Applicant

Shri R. Kshetrapala

V/s The Director of Postal Services
Karnataka & another

To

1. Shri R. Kshetrapala
Retired Postal Assistant
Postal Colony
Hassan
2. Shri M. Madhusudhan
Advocate
1074-1075, Banashankari I Stage
Sreenivasanagar 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

Halli
SECTION OFFICER
(JUDICIAL)

o/c.

*Recd one copy
D.D. Panel
3.7.87*

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.



Have
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE.

sd ———
Vice-Chairman *1/9/90*

sd ———
Member (A)