

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

O.A.NO.621/2002

Tuesday, this the 5th day of March, 2002

Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (A)

1. Radhey Shyam s/o Shri Suresh Rai
Type II, A-35, Chidya Colony
IARI Pusa, New Delhi-12
2. Janak Rai s/o Shri Ram Khilavan Rai
I-83, Chidya Colony
IARI Pusa, New Delhi-12
3. Hosila Pershad s/o Shri Mahi Lal
865, Krishi Kunj
IARI Pusa, New Delhi-12
4. Dinesh Poddar s/o Shri Laxman Poddar
Type II A-17, Chidya Colony
IARI Pusa, New Delhi-12
5. Sanjeev Kumar s/o Shri Radhey Sham Poddar
1687, Krishi Kunj
IARI Pusa, New Delhi-12
6. Kailash Chand s/o Shri Moti Ram
7. Dalip Yadav s/o Shri Ram Sajan Rai
8. Mukesh Kumar s/o Shri Asrafi Rai
I-251, Block No.18, Chidya Colony
New Delhi-12
9. Lalan Mahto s/o Shri Jai Mangal Mahto
801, Krishi Kunj
Pusa, New Delh-12
10. Ram Lalit s/o Shri Ram Swaroop
801, Krishi Kunj
Pusa, New Delhi-12
11. Ramesh Chander s/o Shri Lakhi Ram
D-379, Mahavir Enclave Pt.III
Gali No.58, New Delhi-59.

..Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri S.L.Hans)

Versus

1. Union of India
through Secretary
ICAR Krishi Bhavan
New Delhi-1
2. Director (Administration)
IARI Pusa
New Delhi-12

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants.

2. The applicants in the present OA, 11 in number, have worked on casual basis for varying periods of time from 1984 upto 1992 as shown in clause 4.1 of the OA. None of them has been engaged after termination of service. They have, in all, worked for varying periods ranging from 10 days in one case to 119 days in the best case. The prayer made is for a direction to the respondents to reengage the applicants as daily wager in preference to freshers and juniors. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that the aforesaid prayer should be granted subject to availability of work.

3. The filing of the present OA has obviously been grossly delayed as the last person among the applicants whose services were terminated worked in September, 1992 and never thereafter. The relevant provision made in the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 provides for a definite time frame within which the Tribunal should be approached in such cases. There is also a provision for filing an application for condonation of delay justifying the delay in filing the application. The applicants have not filed any application for condonation of delay. The learned counsel appearing on their behalf has also not been able to explain the gross delay which has taken place in approaching this Tribunal. In the circumstances, the present OA is ^{found to be} badly hit by the ^{aforesaid} law of limitation. The same is rejected as time barred.

(S.A.T. Rizvi)
(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

/sunil/