

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex (BDA)
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 23rd Sep '88

APPLICATION NO.

1042 / 88 (F)

W.P. NO.

—

Applicant(s)

Smt. B. R. Nagarathna

To

Respondent(s)

VS 3D of Census Operations, Karnataka
and Any.

1. Smt. B. R. Nagarathna,
Accountant,
C/o The Director of
Census Operations, Karnataka,
No. 21/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore-17.

2. Shri S. Ranganath Josi,
Advocate,
'Vagdevi', 36, Shankara Park,
Shantacarpuram,
Bangalore - 560 004.

3. The Joint Director of Census -
Operations, Karnataka,
21/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore - 560 027

4. The Registrar General.
- of India,
2/A, Mansingh Road,
New Delhi.

5. Shri M. Varaddeva Rao,
Addl. CGSC,
High Court Building,
Bangalore-1.

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 13 Sep 88.

Encl : As above

0/C for *AP/By*
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1988

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

APPLICATION NO.1072/88(F)

Smt. B.R. Nagarathna,
Accountant,
O/o the Director of Census
Operations Karnataka,
No.21/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore-27.

.. Applicant

(Shri S. Ranganath Jois .. Advocate)

v.

The Joint Director of Census
Operations in Karnataka,
21/1, Mission Road,
Bangalore-560 027.

The RegistrarGeneral of India,
2/A, Mansingh Road,
New Delhi.

.. Respondents

(Shri M. Vasudeva Rao .. Advocate)

This applications came up for hearing before this Tribunal
today. Hon'ble Vice-Chairman made the following:-

ORDER

This is an application made under Section 19 of the
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The facts of this case
and the question of law that arise for determination in this
case are similar to A. No.376/88 decided on 27.6.1988
NARASIMHA MURTHY V. JOINT DIRECTOR. The only difference,
if any, is in the post held by the applicant and Narasimha Murthy.
But that difference in the post held by the applicant and
Narasimha Murthy does not make any difference in applying the
principles enunciated in Narasimha Murthy's case. For the



very reasons stated in Narasimha Murthy's case we allow this application in part and direct the respondents to consider the case of the applicant for regularisation as Accountant from the date the rules came into force in accordance with law and the observations made in the case of Narasimha Murthy and pass all such appropriate orders as the circumstances justify with all such expedition as is possible in the circumstances of the case and in any event within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order.

2. Application is disposed of in the above terms.

But in the circumstances of the case we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



bsv

Sd/-
VICE CHAIRMAN 13/4

Sd/-
MEMBER (A) 23/1/88

TRUE COPY

23/1/88
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE