

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.210/00064/2020  
(with MA No.210/00043/2020)**

**Dated this Tuesday, the 28<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2020**

**CORAM : R.VIJAYKUMAR, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)  
R.N.SINGH, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

Pramod Baliram Bali, Aged 45 years,  
lastly working as Assistant Fireman in the office of the  
Personnel Manager C.No.69, Commodore of Yard Department  
Naval Dockyard, Shahid Bhagat Singh Marg, Mumbai 400 023 and  
residing at Theronda Aglechi Wadi, Post Chaul, Taluka Alibag,  
District Raigad, Pin 402 203, Mob.9702522557. **- Applicant**  
**(By Advocate Shri Ramesh Ramamurthy)**

**VERSUS**

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence,  
Government of India, South Block, New Delhi 110 001.
2. The Flag Officer Commanding in Chief,  
Western Naval Command, Headquarters, INS Angre,  
Shahid Bhagat Singh Marg, Mumbai 400 001.
3. The Admiral Superintendent, Naval Dockyard,  
Shahid Bhagat Singh Marg, Fort, Mumbai 400 023.- **Respondents**

**ORAL ORDER**

**Per : R.N.Singh, Member (Judicial)**

Heard Shri Ramesh Ramamurthy, learned counsel for the applicant.

2. In the present application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has challenged the order dated 26.09.2012 (Annexure A-1) by which the respondents have terminated the services of the applicant with effect from 27.09.2012 in terms of the proviso contained at paragraph No.5 of the Naval Dockyard, Mumbai Appointment order No.DYP/P/9496/COY/ENGINE dated 27.02.2007. It is contended therein by the respondents that the Caste Validity Certificate dated 12.01.2009 produced by the applicant was found to be bogus. The applicant has further challenged the order dated 31.12.2012 (Annexure A-2) by which the Appellate Authority



has rejected the appeal preferred by the applicant against the termination order dated 26.09.2012. The applicant has also filed MA No.43/2020 seeking condonation of delay in filing of the aforesaid Original Application. In the present MA, the applicant has sought condonation of delay of 41 months in filing of the present OA. The grounds taken to seek the condonation of delay is that the action taken by the respondents was sudden and without adopting procedure of enquiry and he had completed four years of service in Central Government and he was mislead by seniors and some union officials in the Naval Dockyard. He further contends that the applicant was also busy in doing some odd jobs in order to earn livelihood and to sustain his family and in this background, the applicant has sought the condonation of delay. There cannot be any quarrel about jurisdiction of the Tribunal under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, this Tribunal may condone the delay caused in approaching the Tribunal. However, it is the settled law that reasons seeking condonation of delay must be sufficient and good ground. The sufficient and good. The applicant is required to some reasons beyond his control which have prevented him in approaching the Tribunal.

3. In the aforesaid background of the settled law, we have considered the contentions made by the learned counsel for the applicant to seek condonation of delay. The applicant has sought 41 months of delay whereas on face of it and also admitted it is apparent the cause of action arose to the applicant at least 84 months prior to his filing of the present Original Application. It is the admitted case of the applicant that the impugned orders have not been passed suddenly.

4. The applicant has joined the Police investigation and even he has approached the Learned Sessions Court for the relief(s) in the criminal case in which he has succeed by way grant of Bail. Meaning thereby the applicant was well versed with legal provisions and the investigation and his rights



under the law to approach the Courts and Tribunal. He further contends that the applicant has been doing some odd jobs to earn livelihood in order to sustain his family. But he has chosen not to approach this Tribunal or any legal forum of competent jurisdiction against his termination from the services of the respondents.

5. The aforesaid facts clearly indicate that reasons or justification for not approaching this Tribunal all along for around 84 months had not been beyond his control. The present MA appears to be a mere formality in order to seek the indulgence of the Tribunal which cannot be granted in the facts and circumstances.

6. Accordingly, the MA fails and same is dismissed.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the OA also fails and is dismissed.

8. However, in the facts and circumstances, no order as to costs.

(R.N.Singh)  
Member (Judicial)

(R.Vijaykumar)  
Member (Administrative)

kmg\*

JD  
05/02



