

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated: 23 FEB 1994

APPLICATION NO(s) 301 of 1994.

APPLICANTS: Gopal

v/s. RESPONDENTS: Chief Supdt.CTO, B'lore  
and others.

T.O.

1. Dr.M.S.Nagaraja, Advocate, No.11, First Cross,  
Second Floor, Sujatha Complex, Gandhinagar,  
Bangalore-9.
2. The Chief Superintendent,  
Central Telegraph, Bangalore-1.
2. Sri.M.S.Padmarajaiah, CGSC,  
High Court Bldg, Bangalore-1.

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 17-02-1994.

copy read

JTG  
23/2/94

gm\*

Issued  
23/2/94

for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

Re Shanthi 28/2

O/C

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.301/94

THURSDAY, THIS THE 17TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1994

SHRI JUSTICE P.K. SHYAMSUNDAR

... VICE CHAIRMAN

SHRI T.V. RAMANAN

... MEMBER (A)

Shri Gopal  
Aged 37 years,  
S/o Sri Shivarao  
1/2, 4th Main  
Matalehalli  
Bangalore - 560 032

... Applicant

( By Advocate Dr. M.S. Nagaraja )

Vs.

1. The Chief Superintendent,  
Central Telegraph Office,  
Bangalore.

2. The Director,  
Telecom,  
Bangalore Area,  
Bangalore - 560 009.

3. Union of India,  
represented by  
Secretary to Government,  
Ministry of Communications,  
Sanchar Bhavan,  
New Delhi.

4. The Chief General Manager,  
Telecom,  
Karnataka Circle,  
Bangalore - 560 008.

... Respondents

( By Advocate Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah,  
Senior Standing Counsel for Central Govt.)

ORDER

Shri Justice P.K. Shyamsundar

After having heard Dr. Nagaraja, we direct Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah, Standing Counsel to take notice. We find that applicant has still to exhaust one more remedy by filing a

revision petition. He has not exhausted that remedy. In similar circumstances, we have directed applicant, to exhaust the remedy before seeking any relief from the Tribunal. (see order in OA 486/93). Accordingly, we ~~make~~ <sup>do</sup> a direction to the applicant to approach the revision authority and subject to the outcome of the same, it will be open to him to seek any further ~~direction~~ <sup>order</sup> from us, if necessary.

2. With this observation, this application stands disposed off. However, we think it just and proper to stay the recovery of the alleged loss of revenue to Government referred to in the OA till the revision petition is disposed of, subject, however to the condition that the applicant files a revision petition within six weeks from the date of this order.

Sd-

( T.V. Ramanan )  
Member (A)

psp.

Sd-

( P.K. Shyamsundar )  
Vice Chairman

TRUE COPY

S. Shanthi 23/2  
SECTION OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE