

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

* * * * *

Commercial Complex (BDA)
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 9 SEP 1988

APPLICATION NO.

1187

/ 88(F)

W.P. NO.

Applicant(s)

Miss B. Sunanda

To

1. Miss B. Sunanda
20, 'Keerthi'
Near Theatre
Varthur
Bangalore - 560 087

2. Shri M. Thimmaraya Swamy
Advocate
Mallikarjuna Temple Building
Rajaram Mohan Roy Road
Bangalore - 560 027

3. The Senior Architect
Telecommunications
4th Floor, Chandralok Complex
Secunderabad (Andhra Pradesh)

Respondent(s)V/s The Senior Architect, Telecom, Secunderabad(AP)
& another

4. The Architect
Telecommunications
1st Floor, 30/1, Leeman's Complex
Cunningham Road
Bangalore - 560 052

5. Shri N. Umapathy
Advocate
3000, 12th 'A' Main Road
HAL II Stage
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Received
dated 9/09/88
Prabhakara Reddy V
(Applicant's brother-in-law)

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(s) on 7-9-88.

Encl : As above

K. N. Reddy
a-a-88
O/C DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1988

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

APPLICATION NO. 1187/88

Miss. B. Sunanda,
D/o Rama Reddy,
Aged about 24 years,
residing at No. 20,
'Keerthi', near Theatre,
Varthur, Bangalore.

.... Applicant.

(Shri M. Thimmaraya Swamy, Advocate)

v.

1. The Senior Architect,
Telecom, 4th Floor,
Chandralok Complex,
Secunderabad.
2. The Architect,
Telecom, 1st Floor,
No.30/1, Leeman's Complex,
Cunningham Road, B'llore.

.... Respondents.

(Shri N. Umapathy, Advocate)

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

ORDER



This is an application made under Section 19 of the
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 (Act').

2. The applicant who was working as an Architect Assistant Grade II on an ad hoc basis in the office of the 2nd respondent and had not been called for interview for regular selection had sought for a direction to the respondents to consider her case for selection along with all other eligible candidates.

3. Shri N. Umapathi, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the applicant had been interviewed on 29.8.88 alongwith others and the results of selection which had not so far been announced will be announced in due course. From this it follows that the respondents had considered the case of the applicant for selection. If that is so, then there is nothing more that survives for our consideration. With this there is no impediment for the announcement of the results and the authorities will do so in accordance with law. With these observations, we dispose of this application as having become unnecessary. But, in the circumstances of the case, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.

Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN 7/7/88

Sd/-

MEMBER (A) 7-8-88

TRUE COPY

R. V. Venkateshwaran
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JDL) 9/9/88

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

