

ANNEXURE - I

List of papers in Original Application No.

9W92

Sl. No. Of Papers.	Date of Papers Or Date of Filing.	Description of Papers.
	27-7-93.	Part <u>1</u> I
		Original Judgement
		O.A. & Material Papers.
		Counter
		Reply Counter

PART - I, PART - II, PART - III  
Destroyed.

  
ra/b/99.

DA. 96/92

(7)

Date	Office Note	Orders
16/6/93		<p>Time is now 3:00 pm.          None for the applicant.          No representation on behalf of          the applicant. Mr. M.R. Devraj,          for the respondent reports          ready. List this OA for          orders of rejection on          2.7.93.</p> <p>T. C. R.          HTCSR          M(J)</p>
2.7.93		<p>Mr. Jagannatha Rao for Mr          Rao for the applicant seeks          List the OA under the same heading          on 5.7.1993 before the Division Be</p> <p>T. C. R.          HTCSR          M(J)</p> <p>Mr. Jagannatha Rao for Mr. D.          Linga Rao for the Applicant is          present. As per the orders of          the Single Member Bench dt. 2/1          this OA ought to be listed by          the Division Bench. Inspite of          said orders, the same is not</p>
6-7-93		<p>Contd -</p>

OA 94/92

Date	Office Note	Orders
1.7.93		before this Bench (single Member Bench) today. List this OA before the Division Bench on 9-7-1993. T - C.R. HTCR T(J)
21.7.93		Heard the arguments in the application counsel for party. No one party is present. adjourned to next hearing on 21.7.93. T - C.R. V HTCR T(J)
22.7.93		on the request of the applicants counsel, adjourned to 23/7/93
23.7.93		T - C.R. 1 HTCSR T(J) 1 HA84 T(A)
24.7.93		OA disposed of as no became infractions. No OA 89/93 also disposed T - C.R. 2 (HTCR) (HABG) T(J) M(A)

Office Q2 with MF 8963.

Date	Office Note	Orders
17/3/93		<p>Line is on 22/3/93. As requested by appraiser, Council.</p> <p><u>Hunes</u> <u>ATTC</u> <u>Hess</u> <u>ATTC</u></p> <p>By order, <u>ATTC</u> for <u>Regitmen</u></p> <p><u>12-4-93</u></p>
12-4-93		<p>Post on 19-4-93.</p> <p><u>HVNFT</u> <u>ATTC</u> <u>HPTT</u> <u>ATTC</u></p> <p>By order, <u>ATTC</u></p> <p><u>Regitmen</u></p> <p>Post on 26/4/93</p> <p><u>HPTT</u> <u>ATTC</u> <u>Hunes</u> <u>ATTC</u></p> <p>By order, <u>ATTC</u></p> <p><u>Regitmen</u></p>
27/4/93		<p>Post on 30/4/93.</p> <p><u>HPTT</u> <u>ATTC</u> <u>Hunes</u> <u>ATTC</u></p> <p>By order, <u>ATTC</u></p> <p><u>Regitmen</u></p> <p>Post on 4/5/93.</p> <p><u>HPTT</u> <u>ATTC</u> <u>Hunes</u> <u>ATTC</u></p> <p>By order, <u>ATTC</u></p> <p><u>Regitmen</u></p>
30/4/93		<p>Post on 9/5/93.</p>

HPTT HVNFT  
ATTC Regitmen

(2)

296/92 Lts MA 89/93.

Date	Office Note	Orders
9.6.93.		<p>pon in 15.6.93.</p> <p><u>Herr</u> VC</p> <p><u>Attn:</u> VC</p> <p>On order.</p> <p>On request.</p> <p>pon on 21.6.93 before 2nd Court.</p> <p><u>Herr</u> VC</p> <p><u>Attn:</u> VC</p> <p>On order.</p> <p>On request.</p>
<u>15/6/93</u>		<p>On a request by Mr. Jagannatha Rao for Mr. <del>D. Linga</del> D. Linga Rao OA is adjourned to 24.6.93</p>
<u>22/6/93</u>		<p>T. C. R. HCSR</p> <p>At request of Mr. R. Gopal for Mr. D. Linga R. OA is adjourned to 5/7</p>
<u>24/6/93</u>		<p>T. C. R. HCSR</p>

Date	Office Note	Orders
5-6-92 Contd...		<p>OA. 573/92 is filed to condone the delay of 59 day is dismissed as un-necessary. In view of the fact we have ordered to receive the counter.</p> <p>Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy for R<sub>1</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> has filed counter opposing admission of this OA. After hearing both sides we are satisfied that this is a fit matter for adjudication, hence <u>admit</u> the OA. Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy submits that the counter filed opposing admission of the OA may be treated as counter to this OA. Mr. N. Bhaskara Rao, for R<sub>3</sub> (Union of India) requests 8 weeks time for filing reply to this OA. Hence 8 weeks time is granted to the 3rd respondent to file a reply to this OA with a copy to the Advocate for the applicant. The applicant may file his rejoinder if any within 2 weeks thereafter. Keep the case before the Registrar for directions after the pleading are complete.</p>
		<p>transages</p> <p>(HABG) w(A)</p> <p>T - C. m (HCSR) w(J)</p>
R-3 Served Counter affidavit Filed by Sri D. Panduranga Reddy Sp. Counsel for State of AP for R <sub>1</sub> & R <sub>2</sub>	Before the D.R. (J) Counter	<p>Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy Even after granting 8 weeks time for filing counter, the counter is not filed. Hence post before court for orders.</p> <p>8/4/92 Dy. Registrar (J)</p>

OF. 94/92

4

Date	Office Note	Orders
19892		<p><u>Office. 94/92</u></p> <p>6' weeks time is allowed to the learned Counsel for the respondents for filing the Counter affidavit. <del>in</del> thereafter for hearing it. Counter is filed.</p> <p>T - C. m H.C.M H.M.S</p>
30-9-92	<u>Before the D.R.(5)</u> for Counter	<p>Even after granting 6 weeks time for filing Counter, the Counter is not filed. Hence post the case in usual course</p> <p><del>8889</del> Dy. Registrar (C)</p>
5.2.93		<p>or the required order of applicant counsel putting</p> <p>9.2.93</p> <p><del>H.V.N.A.S</del> H.V.N.A.S ve</p> <p><del>H.V.N.A.S</del> H.V.N.A.S ve</p>
9-2-93 10.2.93	Reorder filed by Mr. D. Lalgan Rao, Adv. on. 9/2/93	<p>post <del>after</del> the case for filing on top of the list on 16-3-93</p> <p>No counter is necessary for Central Govt (R3).</p> <p><del>H.V.N.A.S</del> H.V.N.A.S ve</p> <p><del>H.V.N.A.S</del> H.V.N.A.S ve</p>

(P.T.O.)

H.V.N.A.S  
M.C.A.

# Central Administrative Tribunal

HYDERABAD BENCH

O.A. No./T.A. No. .... 94 | 1992

V. P. Bahulayan Nair.....

Applicant (s)

Chief Secretary, G.A.D., Hyderabad..... Respondent (s)

Date	Office Note	Orders
6-2-92		<p>Sri Abinandh, Advocate for Sri P. Linga Rao, learned counsel for the applicant, <del>Sri</del> Sri Maran Bhagat Rao, learned counsel for the Respondents No. 3 and Sri D. Pandu Ranga Reddy, learned counsel for the Respondents No. 1 and 2 are present and heard.</p> <p>I issue notice before admission to the Respondents for filing counter within 3 weeks with an advance copy to the learned counsel for the applicant.</p> <p>List the case on 27-2-92.</p> <p>W.M. (HCSR) MJS</p> <p>When the case called, there was no representation from the applicant side. Sri D. Pandu Ranga Reddy, learned counsel for A.P. Govt., requests for three more weeks time for filing counter. Hence list the case on 27-3-92. The Respondents to</p> <p>(P.T.O.)</p>

(5)

O.A. 10/92

Date	Office Note	Orders
26-3-92		file fresh counter one week before prior to 27-3-92, with a copy to the learned counsel for the applicant. T - C - R (HRBS) (TCR) M(A) M(J)
27-3-92		Sri D.Linga Rao, learned counsel for the applicant present. Sri D.Pandu Ranga Rao, learned counsel for the A.T.Government was not present. In view of this the case is adjourned to 13-4-92. Sri D.Pandu Ranga Reddy, special counsel for A.P. Government is directed to produce the confidential records of the applicant concerned the period in question, since the matter is likely to be disposed-of at the admission stage itself. T - C - R (HRBS) (HCJR) M(A) M(J)
27-4-92.		None present on behalf of applicant. At the request of Mr. D. Pandu Ranga Reddy, sc for state set for AP for R12 on 2/6/92 adjourned to 5-6-92.
5-6-92.	counter filed by Mr. D. Pandu Ranga Reddy, sc for state set for AP for R12 on 2/6/92	T - C - R (HTCSR) M(J)
		None present on behalf of applicant. Mr. N. Shankara Rao, Counsel for R <sub>3</sub> and Mr. D. Pandu Reddy, for R <sub>1</sub> and R <sub>2</sub> are present.

CA NO. 91 of 1992 (6)

20-4-92

On a request by Mr. Subba

Rao on behalf of Mr. D. Linga Rao

Counsel for the applicant, list

this case for admission hearing

on 27-4-92.

Y  
HRBS  
7(1)

Adm  
H.C.J.R  
M(J)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD.

OA 94/92.

Dt. of Order: 27-7-93.

Velaylidhan Pillai Bahulayan  
Nair

....Applicant

Vs.

1. Government of Andhra Pradesh,  
represented by its Chief Secretary  
to Government, General Administra-  
tion Department, Secretariat, Hyd.
2. Director General & Inspector General  
of Police, AP, Hyderabad.
3. Union of India, rep. by the  
Secretary, Department of Personnel  
and Training, New Delhi.

....Respondents

-- -- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri D.Linga Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri D.Pandu Ranga Reddy, Sp1.

Counsel for AP State

-- -- -- : Shri N.R. Deva Iyer Sp. G.H.S.

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI A.B.GORTHI : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI T.CHANDRASEKAR REDDY : MEMBER (A)

(Order of the Divn. Bench passed by Hon'ble  
Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member (A) ).

-- -- -- --

Aggrieved by the adverse remarks endorsed in  
for the years ending

his Annual Confidential Records ended A 31-3-88 and 31-3-1989,

the applicant filed O.A.94/92 with a prayer that the said

adverse remarks should be expunged from his A.C.Rs. During

the pendency of this O.A. the applicant was promoted to the

post of Additional Director General of Police in the scale

To

1. The Chief Secretary to Government.  
Govt. of A.P., General Administration Dept.,  
Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Director General & Inspector General of Police,  
A.P. Hyderabad.
3. The Secretary, Dept. of Personnel and Training  
Union of India, New Delhi.
4. One copy to Mr. D. Linga Rao, Advocate, 1-1-258/10/C  
Chikkadapally, Hyderabad.
5. One copy to Mr. N.R. Devraj, Sr.CGSC.CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr. D. Panduranga Reddy, Spl. Counsel for A.P. Govt.  
CAT.Hyd.
7. One spare copy.
8. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.

PVM.

*300214  
PVM  
3/6/83*

.. 2 ..

of Rs.7,300--7,600. Shri D.Linga Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Shri D.Pandu Ranga Reddy, learned special counsel for the A.P. State are present and heard. Learned counsel for the applicant shows us to-day a letter of the Government of Andhra Pradesh, General Administration Department dt.8-7-93, under which the applicant has been promoted to the post of Additional Director General of Police. As the applicant has thus been promoted, learned counsel for the applicant feels that the adverse remarks of the applicant in A.C.R. lose significance. In this regard Shri Linga Rao, learned counsel for the applicants refers to a decision reported in AIR 1987 SC 1201 (State of Haryana Vs. Shri P.C.Wadhwa, IPS, IGP). In any case his prayer now is that ~~xx~~ as the applicant has since been promoted, ~~xx~~ and the application <sup>for</sup> ~~xx~~ become infructuous. Hence the same is disposed-of as having become infructuous with no order as to costs.

2. No orders need be passed in MA 89/93 and the same  
is thus  
disposed-of.

T. Chandrasekhar Reddy  
(T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY)  
Member (J)

transcript  
(A. B. GORTHI)  
Member (A)

Dated: 27th July, 1993.  
Dictated in Open Court.

avl/

3.  
t.  
Depoty Recidivat (1)

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO  
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.A.B.GORTHY : MEMBER(A)

AND

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.P.T.RIRUVENGADAM:M(A)

Dated: 27-7-1993

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

M.A/R.A/C.A.N.

O.A.No. 94/92  
T.A.No.

(W.P. )

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default.

Rejected/Ordered

No order as to costs.

pvm

