

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

OA 63/2002

New Delhi, this the 9th day of January, 2002

Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member(A)

Suresh Pal S/o Shri Parsa
R/o Vill & PO. Maadhuvihar, H.No.RZ-C/196
Gali No.6, Palam,
New Delhi-45. ...Applicant
(By Advocate: Shri U.Srivastava)

Versus

Union of India through
1. The General Manager
Northern Railway *Baroda House*
New Delhi.

2. The Divisional Railway Manager(Delhi)
D.R.M.Office Estate Entry Road
New Delhi.

3. The Permanent Way Inspector,
Northern Railway, Panipat
Haryana.

...Respondents

O R D E R(Oral)

By Hon'ble Govindan S.Tampi, Member(A)

Heard Shri U.Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicant.

2. The relief sought for in this OA is the issue of direction to respondents to consider the case of the applicant for re-engagement as a casual labourer against juniors and outsiders, in terms of para 11 of Casual Labour Scheme dated 28.8.87 of the Railways with consequential benefits and costs.

3. I have carefully considered the matter. In this case, it is seen that the applicant had worked for a period of five months as casual labourer as far back as 28.5.76 to 27.10.76. Still he is seeking that he be given the benefits of para 11 and considered for re-engagement. It is clear that more than anything else what the applicant seeks by this OA after 25 years, is to get over the obstacles of delay and

laches. The same cannot be permitted as it is not sanctioned in law.

4. The OA, therefore, fails and is dismissed in limine at the admission stage itself.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member(A)

/kd/