

7

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No. 952 of 2002

New Delhi, this the 21st day of October, 2002

**HON'BLE MR. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (JUDL.)**

Kuldeep Singh Rana  
S/o Late Shri Khushal Singh  
R/o House No. 19, 'D' Block,  
Shyam Vihar, Phasell, Najafgarh,  
New Delhi.

-APPLICANT

(By Advocate: Shri H.K. Gupta)

Versus

1. Union of India  
Through: Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Government of India, Central  
Secretariat,  
North Block,  
New Delhi.

2. Director, Intelligence Bureau,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Government of India,  
35, New Complex,  
Sardar Patel Marg,  
New Delhi.

-RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: Shri S.K. Gupta)

O R D E R (ORAL)

The applicant has filed this OA seeking compassionate appointment. A preliminary objection has been taken by the respondents that the application is barred by time as narrated by the applicant himself. In the OA it is mentioned that the applicant's predecessor had expired in the year 1997 on 29.11.1997. Immediately thereafter the applicant had made a representation for grant of compassionate appointment. The said request was rejected vide letter dated 9.6.98 and then vide another letter dated 11.1.1999 when he was again informed that his request for appointment has been rejected but the



8

applicant filed this OA only on 21.3.2002. The respondents have taken a strong objection with regard to limitation.

Though the applicant has filed an application seeking condonation of delay wherein the applicant has alleged that since his mother and brother were not keeping good health so he could not approach the court and the family condition remained in indigent circumstances.

However, the perusal of the application does not show if the applicant was suffering from any handicappedness in approaching the court. The applicant and his mother who were quite vigilant in making representations after representations but had filed this OA only 21.3.2002, so it is not a case where the applicant was not pursuing his remedy but he has been pursuing improper remedy which cannot extend the limitation period at all. Hence, I find that the MA seeking condonation of delay is bereft of any merit and the same cannot be allowed.

Accordingly, the OA cannot be entertained and the same is dismissed. No costs.

  
( KULDIP SINGH )  
MEMBER (JUDL.)

/dinesh/