

16

# Central Administrative Tribunal

R.P. No. 79/91 HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

in

O.A. No. 845/91.

Date of Decision :

2.4.92

--T.A.No--

S.Nageshwar Rao

Petitioner.

Shri S.Ramakrishna Rao

Advocate for the  
petitioner (s)

Versus

The Chief Postmaster-General, A.P. Circle, Hyd. Respondent.  
& o others

Shri N.Bhaskara Rao, Addl. CGSC

Advocate for the  
Respondent (s)

## CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. R.Balasubramanian : Member(A)

THE HON'BLE MR. T.Chandrasekhar Reddy : Member(J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?
5. Remarks of Vice Chairman on columns 1, 2, 4  
(To be submitted to Hon'ble Vice Chairman where he is not on the Bench)

HRBS  
M(A).

HTCR  
M(J).

17

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD.

R.P.No.79/91  
in  
O.A.No.845/91.

Date of Judgment 2. 04. 92

S.Nageshwar Rao

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Chief Postmaster-General,  
A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.
2. The Director of Postal Services,  
Hyderabad Region, Hyderabad.
3. Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices,  
Nizamabad. .. Respondents

---

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri S.Ramakrishna Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri N.Bhaskara Rao, Addl. CGSC

---

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian : Member(A)

Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhar Reddy : Member(J)

| Judgment as per Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian,  
Member(A). |

---

This review petition has been filed by Shri S.Nageshwar Rao under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 against the Chief Postmaster-General A.P.Circle, Hyderabad & 2 others, seeking a revision of the order dt. 4.9.91 passed by this Tribunal in M.A.No.1048/91 filed in the same O.A. The M.A. was for condoning the delay in filing the O.A.

2. After considering the M.A. and hearing both sides this Tribunal vide its order dt. 4.9.91 did not agree to condone the delay in filing the O.A. Hence the O.A. was dismissed on grounds of laches.

14

.....2

3. What the applicant now wants is a pure reconsideration and he has not pointed out any error apparent as such. The review petition is, therefore, dismissed with no order as to costs.

R.Balasubramanian T.Chandrasekhar Reddy  
( R.Balasubramanian ) ( T.Chandrasekhar Reddy )  
Member(A). Member(J).

Dated: 2nd April 92

4  
Dy. Registrar (Jud)

Copy to:-

1. The Chief Postmaster-General, A.P.Circle, Hyderabad.
2. The Director of Postal Services, Hyderabad Region, Hyd.
3. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nizamabad.
4. One copy to Sri. S. Ramakrishna Rao, advocate, CAT, Hyd.
5. One copy to Sri. N. Bhaskara Rao, Addl. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
6. One spare copy.

Rsm/-

2019  
2

TYPED BY

R.P. 79/91

O.A. 845/91

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

THE HON'BLE MR.

V.G.

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY:  
MEMBER (JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. C.J. ROY : MEMBER (JUDL)

Dated: 2/4/1992.

ORDER / JUDGMENT

R.A./C.A./M.A. No. 79/91

in

O.A. No.

845/91

T.A. No.

(W.P. No. \_\_\_\_\_)

Admitted and interim directions  
issued

Disposed of with directions

R.P Dismissed ✓

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

M.A. Ordered/Rejected.

✓ No order as to costs.

pvm.

