

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Review Application No.10 of 1994

Dated:- 13 JUN 1994

APPLICATION NUMBER: in 158 of 1994.

APPLICANTS:

RESPONDENTS:

Sri.B.K.Ramanjanappa v/s. Registrar General of India, Delhi & Others.  
Is.

1. Sri.Ravivarmakumar, Advocate, No.11,  
Jeevan Buildings, K.P.East, Bangalore-1.
2. Sri.M.Vasudeva Rao, Addl.C.G.S.C.  
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 09-06-1994.

*S. S. Rao*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR 13/6/94  
for JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

gm\*

*Q. E. Issued*  
*gm*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

REVIEW APPLICATION No.10/94 IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.158/94.

THURSDAY, THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1994.

SHRI V. RAMAKRISHNAN .. MEMBER (A)

SHRI A.N. VUJJANARADHYA .. MEMBER (A)

B.K. Ramanjanappa,  
S/o. Kare Bhemmaiah,  
Aged 35 years,  
Office of the Director of  
Census Operations in Karnataka,  
Mission Road, Bangalore-560027;

... Review Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Ravivarma KUMAR)

Vs.

1. The Registrar General of India,  
No.2/A, Mansingh Road,  
New Delhi - 110 001.
2. The Director of Census Operations  
in Karnataka, No.21/1, Mission Road,  
Bangalore - 560 027.
3. The Deputy Director,  
Office of the Registrar General of India,  
No.2/A, Mansingh Road, New Delhi-110 001. ... Respondents

(By Advocate Shri M. Vasudava Rao)  
Central Govt. Addl. Std. Counsel

ORDER

Shri V. Ramakrishnan, Member (A):

We have heard Shri Ravivarma Kumar, the learned counsel for the Review Applicant Shri Ramanjanappa who has filed the Review Application seeking to review our order dated 17.01.1994 in O.A.No.158/94, where the applicant was seeking a prayer that he should continue as Investigator in the Census Organisation instead of being reverted as Statistical Assistant.



2. On 17.1.1994, after hearing Shri Raviverma Kumar, the learned counsel, we had issued a direction that the representation dated 29.12.1993 which was annexed to O.A.No.158/94 as Annexure-A6 should be disposed off by the respondents and till then the status-quo should continue so far as the applicant is concerned. From the submissions of Shri M.V. Rao, the learned standing counsel as also from the reply statement dated 6.6.1994 filed by the department, it is clear that the department had complied with such directions.

3. Shri Raviverma Kumar's contention is that the order dated 17.1.1994 under review is contrary to law, opposed to the principles of natural justice and error apparent on the face of the record. He also cites the decision of the Tribunal in the case of Lekhi Ram Vs. Union of India reported in (1993) 25 ATC 815 where the Tribunal had held that disposal of the application without giving an opportunity of hearing to the respondent violates the principles of natural justice and such order needed to be reviewed.

4. We are unable to agree with the submissions of Shri Raviverma Kumar. All that we had done was to direct the department to dispose off the representation which was admittedly pending before the department. These orders of 17.1.1994 were dictated in the open court in the presence of Shri Raviverma Kumar. We also find that the respondents had no hesitation in complying with the directions of the Tribunal and they had disposed off the representation by their order dated 11.2.1994 by means of a speaking order. This is produced as Annexure-R1 to the reply statement filed by the respondents. The case quoted by Shri Raviverma Kumar is of no assistance to him as the position herein is that the respondents had carried out the directions of the Tribunal and they had not raised any question that they were not heard before the Tribunal passed the orders on 17.1.1994. In the case quoted by

17 /

Shri Ravivarma Kumar, the respondent department had not complied with the directions of the Tribunal and they made a grievance of they have not having been heard when they were sought to be pulled up for contempt for not complying with the directions. Such is not the case here.

5. In the light of the foregoing, we find no merit in the Review Application which accordingly stands dismissed. If the applicant is aggrieved by the manner in which the department had disposed off his representation by their memorandum dated 11.2.1994, it is open to him to take appropriate steps as per law.



(A.N.VUJJANARADHYA)  
MEMBER (J)

(V.RAMAKRISHNAN)  
MEMBER (A)

TRUE COPY

psp.

*S. S. Sankar*  
18/6  
SECTION OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE