

Karnataka High Court

The Commissioner City Municipal ... vs Smt Saraswathi W/O Manjunath on 9 January, 2009

Author: D.V.Shylendra Kumar

'-' -"r-"~ .*-W.-9°--.-7..-«-V-F-.~ -*".--"W-I,*r-'IIa7II~r'I- =I-II-wI-a-Ia-uI\tI\!- 'Ill' mum -mun
t..ui.nn- ur'mmtNA'mIm RIG!-I COURT 'OF KARNATAKA 'HIGH COUIE IN THE HIGH center or
KARNIATAKA cmcurr BENCH AT Guyggmsa Dated this the 937* day of Jan112:\$'§§*, BEE---'□RE;

THE: 2»IoN*nLE MR J2IS'ii'§§3E} _ l3'i7 imma□" Requiar Fif\$f 2 '?§;3g3ea\$A "M 19;;
iv-,¢{ '5.:{roa;? Between:

Ti-IE Co\$.€MISSIE:I\¥E'r? 1,'; ..

czm' MLINECIPAL-COE\$NCEL Bimiaé. V 8ID;«.:€2_.';';s': 'i2::C'1': ' APPELLANT' V 5;,
1\f,ad;3go'L1da, Adv.,) t ' 1:

--. S§~JE.'f' 'SAjR.z%;\$§§%;m.?:::%1v: .. ' ' W/ o .w;1~;;;Ur<:.¢;r*:.:.' A V-.r;;><:.....
I9-f.'§>LJ"S?{.E;HC}'i.,E3 wow 1%»; o :1?:\$x1<ALWA'D:' 3; ma TALU £2;

I{3I\$}.£%R"" .i3IS_TR~£CT V =_+;~";f;'A;*: '___E :31? mmgfaéég _ R%';E?._Bff yrs SECR ETARY
'V .j~a;:::3ANA SOUQHA . '3r_§=~;G;:LoRE;~9:

" 2% DEPIJTY CQMNEESSEENEEQ ' Bzbzmiz; DISTRECET 'iE:\$"§E1'25s.R ""E"f--~1E
AB\$é\$N\$ST'RATGR CITY M\$;§N\$CiPAL CQUNQEL BIBAR DESTRECY RESP{3NU\$}Wi'S '-H '
-VI I vvvlU Ur AHKIVMIHKH HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF WNATAKA
HIGH' CCU' the daiay is neither intentionai nor deJibetrz.it\$:.':\$1:r5i:i fh€refore j{1Stifi€S ta
{2(')I7id€)I'i*-'\$3 the delay.

5. I have heard Sri R V ' i'<;>i':

the appellant, perused' _aLp;ji'iCa,tio;\$} suppovertng af□lavit and lockegl 'ii11cjgm:.\$□'-Aefv' □the
lawer mart and the rslevani (ii>%:11133;'c;;r;3; piagiéd» Cass;

6. in 3-._£h€\$"'fH'\$t'. i111Stan.¢<f; ,V " : iEi'id that the explanation
offered"~iS"-:.*£?:;ith<é;f:*"~éi'-Su□cie□t explanation nor a serious a'££_::~:~.r1:~pt ééiay in a
proper manner. Excapt for 1:123 rQ:_:i51ié;A 1:tVii&;ei11e11t of papers in any gaverrztnt
unicriality, there: is abssoiutely :10 other 'A mentiozxed. EV(;*\${'}'? govemmant appaal 91' public
bad}; if invoivss Ci□iijé in presentation €i1f1é j\$;:Q iimutine mcvement Qf' files, it is far E115
appeiaz□is V x' steps in acivanae and not to Wait: ti□the East éatew Ba ihat; as it may, I (it) not
□hd may preps: expiaxzation justifying the Co□lanatién, af inordinate dalay 2'29 days in preferrizzg
this appeai,

--n.u-. mun yuulu Ur KARNATAKA H16!-I COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF
KARNATA&:WH!G!4 COUR preferred any fm□zer appea} and r\$é_<:_\$f_vm11ch scopé for
ir1rterferiI:g with \$16 decree if} this 81313631, ""~f:%\$1" Corléoizing the delay, " i□é was liotifzsci

anci no objectiél-"., the ciam of defendaniuziixzicigikglity ; "

10. I12j;};:z'2:._15fcs1.1:\$.__i:, s;pj\$1i%:af<i€?rlff. for czm□aning tha delay and the
ajégsééi'--23ré"€iiSin\$ssed. Sd/ -

JUDGE .- ----. ----- ~. .~. __~:-#7. 2-xv'-v~ "''''''''''''f."?'Iia-wuaI!'I --u.I~'u',I- wvunl ill" lP\I\l*' '
l''lI\7!'1 UKJUKI "Ur NNKNHIKKA "35"" COURT OF IN THE HIGH center or KARNATAKA
cmcurr BENCH AT GULEARGA Bafsd this the 93* day of Jan11E:':\$', 1 ' BEFGI«L\$§:A THE
HGL!'BI.»E3 MR J{Is'i:'£CE';__'D"ii \$§HYE;Y3r}\$:I};f!_§v;§;i{Uh\$□R " Requiar 23%: ,?i';§;)ealA
]*fo_ 1 9: Between:

THE camimxssz □gwae , AA cm' MLINECIFAEA-.3 o\$ _\$'?€'C\$ L B:I:;=A\$2._
B:b\$§e.4<:::~s%*R;{<:T; ' APPELLANT' V 11.. V F%\$§';\$é\$1goL1da, Adv") " 'Arm:

.s;a<;%I"::vs~;::<_s;s:i5¢;zx*:fz~i1;--., ' - wzcz --.\$JEAP€;iUNATi\$ =(3C3C1:
P~iQLT*SE;E.-I{;3--\$,E?3 iazom R--;iO;vRAX{;:gLv:AE::z~' BEAR 'rsu,U:»:

E3£Ef}AR""i3IS_'1_'_Rv;C'\$' '<.\$'fAif'E arr' KAE'2'JA""i'A\$isha R\$f:E:ZB';' YES SECRETARY «
"~V1::;sa';;NA SOUDHA ':%;£¢i'GgL@RE;~9:

mg DEPIJTY COMI*v'E\$S\${\$?€E\$%3. \. " B£D,M€. DISTRECT "&\$§':)2%R TEES
ASMENESTRATQR CITY MLENKEEPAL C{}UNC.\$L Blf□□? Dls'?R\$C"{' REZSP{3N}\$£E'~3TS "
'-H ' "VI I V-vvnl Ur AHIKIVMII-"EA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF
KARNATAKA H5o" CCU! the delay is neither intentienai nor deLibe:z%a\$;§:.\$:::i t1';gerefore
justifies to condone the delay.

5. I have heard Sri R V bi'adé%,5gfGiidé. ' i'oi' the appellant, perused» V_ ap}jic3.tio\$ì»'-arid'
suppét□hg af□lavit and lookegi fii1r\$,gIné□iv--.of-{he iower mutt and the relevant déégji□exii the
case.

6. in \$',:h\$;¢:V'»»"□'3t.'. if;_'. \$1fanr\$.e_""IV"f:i'i(i that the explanation offered
--v..if37--r\$;7itha~:f-.z\$ì""L.*-sv□ciejixt explanation 1:191' a serious atégenjpt ole-my in a proper
1333111161'. Except for tbs %ro2iii1iTé.A'111Vdv.ra:nent of papers in any govemmant J
I1%L:'lIi}i(ZipEi}ii'Z'i, there is absolutely no other mentianed. Every government appasai o:' public
body if involves étiiay in presentation .u{i1z1é j\$e\$' Eautine inavément ef □es, it is for the appeilazai
£9 ' AA ' steps in advance and not ta wait: tiil {ha East: date. Ba {hat as it may, I dc) net find any
prepay' axpiarzafion ju□ifying the ccmdarxaticcm sf inordimata delay 229 days; in prefarring this
appeai.

6% ArA;A men came

- - -..n...-. mun uuulu Ur IUARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA H16!-I COURT OF
KARN preferred any fauiher appea} and ;%:::a""t_v:n11ch scape for interferizzg with Fhe decrea in
this appeal, coxlcioiing the delay, .ti1QfV_1g1□' W85 I"i()t\$fi€2Ci and 1:20 objecti

§11*1.V',V£_i1e□l" the claim of dafaudané:~1I21113iC§i;§%;1i:§;L u 2

10. In for candaning the deiay and t.};71é V Sc1/ -

JUDGE