

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH**  
**JABALPUR**

**Original Application No.200/00769/2019**

Jabalpur, this Wednesday, the 15<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2020

**HON'BLE SHRI NAVIN TANDON, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**  
**HON'BLE SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Smt. Snehlata Neware, W/o Suraj Neware, Age 57 years  
R/o Ward No. 18 Sujan Dharamshala ke pass, Balaghat,  
Distt. Balaghat, M.P.-481001

**-Applicant**

(By Advocate –**Shri Varun Nathan proxy counsel for Shri Vasant R. Daniel**)

**V e r s u s**

1. Union of India, through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Communication and IT,  
Department of Posts,  
Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi 110001 and others

2. Director General Post, Department of Posts,  
Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi 110001

3. Chief Post Master General,  
Madhya Pradesh Circle,  
Hoshangabad Road, Bhopal 462012 (MP)

4. Director Postal Services (Headquarter)  
O/o Chief Post Master General,  
Madhya Pradesh Circle,  
Hoshangabad Road, Bhopal 462012 (MP)

5. Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Balaghat Division,  
Balaghat 4840011 (MP)

**- Respondents**

(By Advocate –**Shri N.K.Mishra**)

**O R D E R (ORAL)****By Navin Tandon, AM:-**

This Original Application has been filed against the compulsory retirement of the applicant vide order dated 27.06.2017 (Annexure A-3).

2. M.A. No. 200/1059/2019 has been filed by the applicant with a prayer for condonation of delay submitting therein that there is a delay of five months 20 days for the reasons as under:

*“(3).That the applicant is not keeping well and has been waiting for the adjudication of her mercy representation that was filed by her after her representation before the Learned Secretary Department of Post and Telecommunication.”*

3. The respondents have objected to the grant of condonation of delay showing that the delay has not been explained.

4. They have also questioned that the applicant has not produced any documentary evidence to say that she was not keeping well.

5. It is seen that the applicant has not been following her case in time. Her representation against the

compulsory retirement was also submitted to the competent authority after a delay, which has been decided on 06.02.2018 (Annexure A-8), wherein it has been held that “for the reasons that the decision to prematurely retire Ms. Snehlata Neware on grounds of ineffectiveness is justified keeping in view the poor track record of the official and for the reasons that her representation is barred by limitation”.

**6.** Subsequently, the applicant has approached this Tribunal on 08.08.2019.

**7.** We have considered and find that there is no explanation for condonation of delay.

**8.** In view of the above, the application for condonation of delay is rejected. Accordingly, the Original Application is dismissed at the admission stage itself as barred by limitation.

**(Ramesh Singh Thakur)**  
**Judicial Member**  
rn

**(Navin Tandon)**  
**Administrative Member**