

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560 038.

Dated: 3 AUG 1993

APPLICATION NO(s). 220 of 1993.

Applicant(s) R.Sampangirem

v/s.

Respondent(s) Air Officer

Commanding, Airforce,
Bangalore & Ors.

To

1. Sri.R.Sampangirem,
S/o.Late Perumal Raghavan,
Ex-Antimalaria Lascar,
Air Force Station,
Jalahalli West,Bangalore.
2. Sri.S.M.H.Ganjami,
Advocate, No.63,
II Floor, Noor Building,
J.C.Road,Bangalore-2.
3. The Air Officer Commanding,
Air Force Station,
Jalahalli West,Bangalore-15.
4. The Air Officer Commanding -in-Chief,
A.F., Hebbal,Bangalore-24.
5. The Joint Director,of Personnel(Civilians),
JDPC,Air Headquarters,Vayu Bhawan,NDelhi.
6. Sri.G.Shanthappa,Central Govt.Stng.Counsel,
High Court Building,Bangalore-1.

SUBJECT:- Forwarding of copies of the Order passed by
the Central Administrative Tribunal,Bangalore Bench
Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/
STAY/INTERIM ORDER passed by this Tribunal in the above said
application(s) on 20-07-93.

Issued

Of

Recd

3/8/93

*for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH : BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY 1993

Present:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar ... Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. V. Ramakrishnan ... Member [A]

APPLICATION NO.220/93

R. Sampyiram,
S/o [Late] Perunal Raghavan,
Aged 31 years,
Ex-Antimalaria Lascar,
Air Force Station,
Jalahalli West,
Bangalore.

... Applicant

[Shri R.N. Deshpande ... Advocate]

v.

1. The Air Officer,
Commanding,
Air Force Station,
Jalahalli West,
Bangalore-560 015.
2. The Air Officer
Commanding-in-Chief,
I.A.F., Hebbal,
Bangalore-560 024.
3. The Joint Director,
of Personnel [Civilians],
[JDPC], Air Headquarters,
Vayu Bhavan,
New Delhi.

... Respondents

[Shri G. Shanthappa ... Advocate]

This application having come up for admission before this
Tribunal today, Hon'ble Vice-Chairman, made the following:

O R D E R

Today the counsel for the applicant files an MP and also
files fresh power. Take notice of the fresh power and substitute
the name of the counsel appearing as of now.



2. In the MP filed today the applicant seeks condonation of delay which is stated to be about two years. We are told that the delay caused is because of the fact the applicant was urging the matter with the administrative authorities. This is not a sufficient ground to condone the delay involved in the filing of a statutory application under the Act. We are, therefore, not persuaded to condone the delay. The MP is accordingly rejected, the application being barred by time also stands rejected.

Sd-

MEMBER [A]

Sd-

VICE-CHAIRMAN

TRUE COPY

D. ALESS
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE
31/8/93

