

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH**

M.A/21/892/2019 & 893/2019 in OASR 2335/2019
HYDERABAD, this the 28th day of November, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. B.V. Sudhakar, Admn. Member**

1. K JANGA REDDY,
S/o Laxma Reddy,
Age about 35 years,
Occupation: Unemployed,
R/o Shankarpally, R.R.District.
2. N SATYANARAYANA GOUD,
S/o Shanker Goud,
Age about 39 years,
Occupation: Unemployed,
R/o Kyssaram Village,
Patancheru Mandal, Medak District.
3. N SRINIVASA REDDY,
S/o N Vittal Reddy,
Age about 36 years,
Occupation: Unemployed,
R/o Yeddumailaram Village,
Sangareddy District.
4. D JAIHIND,
S/o D Mallaiah,
Age about 39 years,
Occupation: Unemployed,
R/o Kyssaram Village,
Patancheru Mandal, Medak District.
5. L SRIKANTH REDDY,
S/o Ramachandra Reddy,
Age about 35 years,
R/o Yeddumailaram Village,
Sangareddy District.

APPLICANTS

(By advocate: Mr. B Pavan Kumar)

Vs.

1. The Union of India represented by
Secretary, Ministry of Defence,
Department of Defence Production &
Ordnance Factories, South Block,
New Delhi-110 011,
2. Ordnance Factory Board rep by its
Chairman and Director General,
Ayudh Bhavan, 10-!, SK Bose Road,
Kolkata 700 001,
3. The General Manager,
Ordnance Factory Project,
Yeddumailaram, Sangareddy Dist.

RESPONDENTS

(By advocate: Mrs. K Rajitha, Sr. CGSC)



ORAL ORDER

PER HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY, CHAIRMAN

Applicants state that their lands were acquired long back for certain projects, taken up by the Government. The Scheme of recruitment of Land Displaced Persons (LDPs) was in force. Stating that their names were not accepted and relief was not granted, the applicants filed OA 601/2013. That was disposed of on 11.10.2013, in terms of an order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in PIL No.378/2013.



2. In response to the said order, the applicants were given a reply on 06.01.2014. It was mentioned therein that LDPs eligible have been accommodated and the case of the applicants cannot be considered for appointment on compassionate grounds. Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court was also referred to. The applicants intend to file O.A., challenging the reply dated 06.01.2014. Since there is a delay of 4 ½ years, the applicants filed M.A. to condone the delay.

3. Applicants contend that the delay occurred on account of the fact that they could not pool proper resources and that they were approaching the parties through various means.

4. Heard Mr.B.Pavan Kumar, learned counsel for the applicants and Mrs.K.Rajitha, learned Sr.Standing Counsel for the respondents at length and perused the record.

5. Even by the year 2014, the claim of the applicants was almost stale. The only direction issued by the Tribunal in O.A.601/2013 was in

terms of the order of Hon'ble High Court. There again, it was clearly mentioned that LDPs do not have any inherent right as such, and at the most, representations can be made for seeking appointment on compassionate grounds. The relief granted was not in terms of any Scheme for recruitment of LDPs. In the reply, the respondents have clearly mentioned the various events that have been taken place from time to time. The delay of 4 ½ years needs valid explanation. When the respondents treated the claim of the applicants in the year 2014 itself that their claim is stale, entertaining any proceedings at this stage would render the very stipulation as to limitation, redundant. We do not find any ground to condone such an inordinate delay.



6. M.A. dismissed. OASR accordingly stands dismissed at the admission stage.
7. There shall be no order as to costs.

(B V SUDHAKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY)
CHAIRMAN

vsn