

REGISTERED

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

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

Dated : 26/6/87

APPLICATION NO 291 /87(F)

W.P. NO _____

Applicant

Shri Kemparaju

V/s The Secy, M/o Home Affairs & 2 Ors

To

1. Shri Kemparaju
85, 8th Main
Jaibharathinagar
Old Guddadahalli
Bangalore - 560 026
2. Shri M.S. Anandaramu
Advocate
128, Cubbonpet Main Road
Bangalore - 560 002
3. The Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs
North Block
New Delhi - 110 001

4. The Director of Census Operations
in Karnataka
No. 21/1, Mission Road
Bangalore - 560 027
5. The Joint Director of Census
Operations in Karnataka
No. 21/1, Mission Road
Bangalore - 560 027
6. 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 ~~XXXX~~/

~~XXXXXX ORDER XXXX~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said
application on 22-6-87.

SECTION OFFICER
(JUDICIAL)

Encl : as above

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 22nd DAY OF JUNE, 1987

Present : Hon'ble Justice Sri K.S.Puttaswamy Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Sri L.H.A.Rego

Member

APPLICATION No. 291/87.

Kemparaju,
r/a No.85, 8th Main,
Jaibharathina gar,
Old Guddadahalli,
Bangalore - 26.

... Applicant

(Sri M.S.Anandaramu

...

Advocate)

Vs.

Secretary to Government,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi.

The Director of Census Operations,
Karnataka,
No.22/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore- 27.

The Joint Director of Census Operations,
Karnataka,
No.21/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore - 27.

... Respondents

(Sri M.V.Rao

...

Advocate)

This application has come up before the court today. Hon'ble Justice Sri K.S.Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman, made the following :

O R D E R

Orders on IA No.1 - Application for condonation or delay.

In filing the main application u/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, there is a delay of nearly 11 months. In IA No.1 filed u/s 21(3) of the Act, the applicant has sought for condoning the delay.

2. IA No.1 is opposed by the Respondents.

3. Sri M.S.Ananda Ramu learned counsel for



the applicant contends that all the facts and circumstances set out in IA No.1 constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay of 11 months and the same be condoned.

4. Sri M.V.Rao contends that every one of the facts and circumstances pleaded by the applicant do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the inordinate delay of 11 months.

5. We have examined every one of the facts and circumstances pleaded by the applicant which were highlighted by Sri Ananda Ramu. We are of the view that every one of them do not constitute a sufficient ground for condoning the inordinate delay of 11 months and IA No.1 calls for rejection.

6. In the light of the above discussion we reject the IA No.1 and subsequently reject Application No.291 also. But in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



Sd/-
VICE-CHAIRMAN

22/6/87

- True Copy -

Sd/-
MEMBER

22.6.87

SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE