

(7)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

OA 123/1998

New Delhi this the 18th day of July, 2000

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Sh. Sham Singh,  
Son of Shri Kacheroo,  
R/O 128-C, Kilogheri Village,  
Srinivasपुरi, New Delhi.

..Applicant

(By Advocate Dr. J. C. Madan )

Versus

1. Lt. Governor of Delhi,  
through his Chief Secretary,  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,  
5, Shamnath Marg, Delhi.

2. The Director General,  
Home Guards,  
C.T.I. Complex, Raja Garden,  
New Delhi.

..Respondents

(By Advocate Sh. Rajinder Pandita )

O R D E R (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))

The applicant has filed this application stating that he is aggrieved by the termination of his services as Home Guard by the respondents order dated 27.10.1994.

2. The applicant has also filed an MA 105/1998 praying for condonation of delay in filing the application.

O.A. has been filed on 8.1.1998. One of the grounds taken by the learned counsel for the applicant is that no notice has been issued prior to the termination of the applicant's services as Home Guard.

3. The respondents in their reply have correctly

13/

taken the stand that the present application is hopelessly barred by limitation, apart from the fact that the Home Guard is a voluntary organisation.

4. The grounds taken by the applicant praying for condonation of delay in filing the application are not sufficient to condone the delay of about four years in filing the OA. He has submitted that he had been making several oral and written representations to the respondents for reinstatement in preference to outsiders and juniors. However, it is settled law that repeated representations do not extend the period of limitation, taking into account the judgement of the Delhi High Court in Mansukh Lal Rawal and Ors Vs. UOI & Ors (CWP No. 4287/1997) decided on 26.5.1999 and the Full Bench judgement of this Tribunal in Inder Singh Tomer and Ors Vs. UOI through Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs and Ors. (OA 1753/1997 with connected cases ) decided on 25.11.1999, the applicant has not made out any case at all.

5. In the result for the reasons given above, OA fails. The same is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

6. However, in case the applicant makes an

13.

application for his enrolment to the respondents as a Home Guard, nothing stated in this order should come in his way, to be considered in accordance with the rules and instructions.

No costs.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)

sk