

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

CP 107/99 in RA 42/98 in OA 428/94

DATE OF ORDER : 1-10-1999.

Between :-

A.Ramakrishna Rao

And

Govt. of India, rep. by its  
Secretary, M/o Information & Broadcasting,  
Sastry Bhavan, New Delhi.

(Other respondents are not necessary to  
this case).

...Respondent/Respondent

-- -- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri K.Lakshmi Narasimha

Counsel for the Respondent : Shri B.N.Sarma, Sr.CGSC

-- -- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A) ).

JK  
=

-- -- --

... 2.

D

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A) ).

-- -- --

Heard Sri K.L.Narasimham, counsel for the applicant and Sri B.N.Sarma, learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

2. The Review Application in OA was disposed of by order dated 22.3.1999. Respondent No.4 in that OA has filed this C.P. The Review Application judgement directs both the applicant in the RA as well as Respondent No.4 to file a detailed representation for disposal. The applicant in this CP, who was Respondent No.4 in the R.A. filed his representation on 15-4-1999. As that representation was not disposed of, this CP has been filed for non implementation of the judgement in the R.A.

3. Eventhough the applicant in the CP was Respondent No.4 in the RA, as the RA judgement gives direction even to the Respondent No.4 to file a representation, it should be stated that Respondent No.4 is also eligible for filing CP.

4. In the RA judgement, no time limit has been fixed. *for disposal*  
Normally the time limit is for six months from the date of receipt of a copy of the representation, if the applicants either in the RA or OA was directed to submit a representation. In this case the applicant in the CP had filed his representation on 15.4.1999, that should have been received by the Respondents atleast a fortnight later. Hence reply should be *given* some time in early November. In that view, we find that the

CP is premature. In view of that no further orders in the CP is considered necessary. Hence the same is closed. However, we observe that the Respondents <sup>should</sup> may dispose of his representation dated 15.4.1999 as early as possible as indicated above.

5. CP is closed. No costs.

B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR)  
Member (A)  
10.

RANGARAJAN)  
Member (A)

Dated: 1st October, 1999.  
Dictated in Open Court.

av1/