

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
BANGALORE - 560 033.

Dated: 4 APR 1995

APPLICATION NO. 752 of 1995.

APPLICANTS: Smt. B.S. Geetha,

V/S.

RESPONDENTS: Secretary, M/o. Health & Family Welfare,  
New Delhi and two others.,

To

1. Sri. Harikrishna S. Holla,  
Advocate, 34/3, II-Floor,  
Fifth Main, Gandhinagar,  
Bangalore-560009.
2. Sri. M. Vasudeva Rao, Addl. C.G.S.C.  
High Court Bldg, Bangalore-1.

Subject:- Forwarding copies of the Orders passed by the  
Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore-38.

---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 28-03-1995.

Issued on  
5/4/95

DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE BENCH.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NUMBER 752 OF 1995

TUESDAY, THIS THE 28TH DAY OF MARCH, 1995.

Mr. T. V. Ramanan,

Member (A)

Smt. B.S. Geetha,  
D/o late Subramanyam,  
Pharmacist, Major,  
residing at No. 221/2,  
6th Cross, Gandhinagar,  
Bangalore-560 009.

.. Applicant.

(By Advocate Shri H.K.S. Holla)

v.

1. Union of India by  
Health Secretary,  
Ministry of Health & Family  
Welfare, Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The Director,  
Central Government Health Scheme,  
Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. The Deputy Director,  
Central Government Health Scheme,  
Infantry Road, Bangalore-560 001.

Respondents.

(By Standing Counsel Shri M. Vasudeva Rao)

ORDER

In this application under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has sought relief vis-a-vis the orders of Respondent-3 dated 19-08-1992 and 27-04-1993 by which the leave sanctioned to the applicant on medical grounds by the same authority stands cancelled and the period of absence from duty is treated as dies non. This case is in all fours with the case decided by this Tribunal in N. LAKSHMANA REDDY v. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS [O.A. NO. 1585 of 1994 decided on 18-01-1995]. -- The learned counsel for the respondents points out some delay in the applicant approaching this Tribunal. So was the position in the application earlier disposed of by this Tribunal referred to supra. But, there also the delay



was overlooked and condoned. Similar treatment is called for herein too.

2. Abiding by the order earlier passed by this Tribunal in Lakshmana Reddy's case supra, I quash the endorsements at Annexure A1 and A3 and maintain that the leave sanctioned to the applicant would stand. Any salary recovered by the authorities from the applicant on this account will have to be paid back to him within a month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

3. This application is decided accordingly. No costs.

Sd-

MEMBER(A)

np



TRUE COPY

*[Handwritten signature]*  
10/4/95

Section Officer  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
Bangalore Bench  
Bangalore