

62

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

M.A. No.110/97
in O.A. 395/93

Date: 30.1.1997

Between:

C. Siva Kumar .. Applicant

And

1. Director General of Employment & Training, M/o Labour, New Delhi.
2. Director of Training, Directorate General of Employment & Training, New Delhi.
3. Director, Advanced Training Institute for Electronics & Process Instrumentation, Hyderabad.
4. Regional Director, Regional Directorate of Apprenticeship Trainings, Ramanthapur, Hyderabad.
5. V.L.Patil, Sr. Technical Assistant, O/o Regional Director, Regional Dte. of Apprenticeship, Hyderabad.

.. Respondents

Smt. P.A.Kamaleshwari .. Counsel for applicant

Mr. N.V.Raghava Reddy .. Counsel for Respondents

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G. CHAUDHARI, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. R. RANGARAJAN, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

O R D E R

Oral Order (Per Hon'ble Mr. R. Rangarajan, Member (A))

Smt. P.A.Kamaleshwari for the applicant.

This M.A. is filed for rectoring the O.A. 395/93 which was dismissed for default by order dated 20.11.96. The O.A. was dismissed after giving number of opportunities to the counsel for the applicant to submit his case, as can be seen



adjournments, the learned counsel did not care to be present in the court nor the applicant was present when the case was posted for dismissal on 20.11.96. We would have shown indulgence into this case had it been a recent case filed in the year 1996, but the case was instituted in 1993 and by the date the case was taken up for hearing on 28.9.96 there was a passage of over 3 years in hearing this case. As the case is of a very earlier origin ^{date} getting back to 1993 we thought it fit not to show any indulgence further and dismissed the O.A. for default.

2. Today this application is filed for restoring the O.A. There is not a single word in this petition to show why the Advocate was not present. It only says that the counsel was rarely visiting the Tribunal and because of that he defaulted for appearing in the case. We examined the order sheets of this case. We found that right after the date of the admission of the petition there was no appearance of the learned counsel for the applicant nor the applicant was present. It looks that even the rare appearance he is ~~making~~ ^{any record} by any record. Hence we are satisfied that the reason given for restoration of the O.A. is not sustainable and because of that we do not incline to restore the O.A. back for hearing on merits. In that view the M.A. is dismissed.

M. G. Chaudhari
K. Rangarajan
Member (Admve.)

M. G. Chaudhari (J)
Vice Chairman

30th January, 1997

vm

Deputy Registrar (S)

1 COURT

TYPED BY

CHECHED BY

COMPARED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.G.CHAUDHARI
VICE-CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. ~~H. RATENDRA PRASAD~~
MEMBER(ADMN)

Dated: 30 - 1 - 1997

ORDER / JUDGMENT

M.A./R.A/C.A. No. 110/97

in

O.A.No.

395/93

T.A.No.

(W.P.)

Admitted and Interim Directions
Issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

pvm.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण
Central Administrative Tribunal

DESPATCH

10 FEB 1997

हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ
HYDERABAD BENCH