

## 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

Respondent(s)

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

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)

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.

Issued  
K. H. M.  
9-9-88  
Encl : As above

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'lore.

.... 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 res-  
pondents 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.



Gr/Mrv.

Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN

7/9/88

Sd/-

MEMBER (A)

7.9.88

TRUE COPY

*B. V. Venkatesh*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JDL) 9/9/88  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE