

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated:- 15 SEP 1994

Miscellaneous Appln. No. 386 & 387/94

IN

APPLICATION NUMBER:

488 of 1993.

APPLICANTS:

Sri. B.R. Panduranga v/s. Chief Supdt. Central Telegraph Office,  
To. Bangalore and Others.

RESPONDENTS:

1. Dr. M.S. Nagaraja, Advocate, No. 11, Second Floor,  
First Cross, Sujatha Complex, Gandhinagar,  
Bangalore-560 009.
2. Sri. M. Vasudeva Rao, Addl. Central Govt. Stng. Counsel,  
High Court Bldg, Bangalore-560 001.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the  
Central administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/  
STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/, passed by this Tribunal in the above  
mentioned application(s) on 31st August, 1994.

Issued on

15/9/94 B

of Es. S. Krishnamurthy  
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

Sri. B. R. Panduranga v/s. Chief Supdt. Central Telegraph Office  
M. A. Nos. 386 & 387/94 in OA 488/93

Date

Office Notes

Orders of Tribunal

(PWS) VC / (VR) MA

31. 8. 1994.

Heard Counsel.

Time for Compliance  
is extended by two more  
months. No further extension.

Sdt

Sdt

VC



TRUE COPY

Se Shanthi  
Section Officer  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Bangalore Bench  
Bangalore

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Misc. Applications No. 265 and  
266 of 1994 in

Dated:- 7 JUL 1994

APPLICATION NUMBER:

488 of 1993

APPLICANTS:

RESPONDENTS:

B.R. Panduranga vs. Chief Supdt. Central Telegraph  
Office, Bangalore and Others

- ① Dr. M.S. Nagaraja, Advocate, No 11, 2nd Floor,  
Sujatha Complex, Defence, Gandhinagar, Blore-9
- ② The Chief General Manager,  
Karnataka Telecom Region,  
1, Ulsoor, Bangalore-8
- ③ Sri M.S. Padmarajah, Sr. CGSC,  
High Court Bldg, Bangalore-1

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Orders passed by the  
Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/  
~~STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/~~, passed by this Tribunal in the above  
mentioned application(s) on 27-06-94

Issued on  
8/7/94

of  
R.

*S. Shanmugam* 7/7  
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

-7-

In the Central Administrative Tribunal  
Bangalore Bench  
Bangalore

Application No. .... 48/93 ..... of 199

B.R. Panduranga vs. Chey. Supdt, Central Telegraph Office, Bangalore & Other

ORDER SHEET (contd)

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
		<p>IR (MA) / ANR (M.J)  <u>27/6/94.</u></p> <p><u>Orders on MA 265 &amp; 266/94.</u></p> <p>Condoning the delay in making the MA for extension of time, time is extended to dispose of the revision petition, before 31st July, 94.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">M.J</p> <p style="text-align: right;">TRUE COPY</p> <p style="text-align: right;">R. Shankar SECTION OFFICER CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH BANGALORE</p> <p style="text-align: right;">7/7</p> 

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore-38.

Dated: 11 FEB 1994

APPLICATION NO(s) 488193.

APPLICANTS:

B.R. Panduranga vs. Chief Suptd. CTO  
TO.

RESPONDENTS:

1. Sri. M.S. Naqvi, Advocate, NO.11,  
2nd floor, Sri Jayanthi Complex, I Cross  
Gandhi Nagar, Bangalore - 23.
2. The Chief Superintendent, Central  
Telegraph. office
3. The Director, Telecommunication  
Bangalore. Telecommunication District  
Bangalore - 9.
4. Union of India by its Secretary  
to Govt. Ministry of Communications  
New Delhi.
5. Sri. M.S. Panduranga alias Srinivas  
Counsel for Central Govt, High Court  
Bengaluru Bangalore.

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

-XXX-

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the  
ORDER/STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/, Passed by this Tribunal  
in the above mentioned application(s) on 5.1.94.

Issued on 2/2/94

N. S.  
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.  
11/2/94

gm\*

to consider and deal with all the points raised in the memorandum of revision and record thereafter an objective conclusion. Under the circumstances we think it appropriate to direct the applicant to prefer a revision petition as aforesaid and to state further that if such a revision petition is preferred within one month<sup>s</sup> from the date of receipt of a copy of this order by the applicant, the revisional authority will dispose off the same within 3 months thereafter by means of an appropriate order which should be vocal or speaking.

We make it clear that this order is strictly confined to the facts and circumstances of the case.

Pending disposal of the anticipatory revision petitions, the recovery ordered by the department which has been stayed by this Tribunal shall continue. If no revision petition is filed as directed supra the benefit of stay order shall cease to be operative in such a situation.

Sd-

MEMBER(A)

Sd-

VICE-CHAIRMAN.



TRUE COPY

N. Deo S 1/2/94  
REGD. OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
NEW DELHI, INDIA  
1994

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NUMBER 488 OF 1993

WEDNESDAY THIS THE 5TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1994.

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, ... Vice-Chairman.

Mr. V. Ramakrishnan, ... Member (A)

B.R. Panduranga,  
Aged about 40 years,  
S/o late B.P. Rangaswamy,  
H-35, 2nd Cross, Magadi Road,  
Bangalore-560 023. ... Applicant.

(By Advocate Dr. M.S. Nagaraja)

v.

1. The Chief Superintendent,  
Central Telegraph Office,  
Bangalore-560 001.
2. The Director,  
Telecommunication,  
Bangalore Telecommunication District,  
Bangalore-560 009.
3. Union of India,  
represented by Secretary to  
Government, Ministry of Communication,  
New Delhi. ... Respondents.

(By Standing Counsel Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah)

O R D E R

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:-

Having heard both sides, we think it appropriate to direct the applicant herein to prefer a revision petition, a remedy that is open to him under Rule 29 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965. We may in passing point out that the revision petition under Rule 29(3) has to be disposed off as it were an appeal, with the result that whoever decides or disposes off the revision petition will have

