

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

O.A. NO.1906/1995

New Delhi this the 5th day of December, 1995.

HON'BLE SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE SHRI R. K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

Rameshwar Dayal S/O Khajan Singh,
R/O House No.64, Block No.30,
Khicharipur, Delhi-91
working as Telegraph Assistant,
Central Telegraph Office,
Janpath, New Delhi-110001. ... Applicant

(In person)

-Versus-

1. The Chairman,
Telecom Commission,
20, Sanchar Bhawan,
Ashoka Road,
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Chief General Manager
Maintenance, Department of
Telecom, Kidwai Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001.
3. Chief Superintendent Telegraph,
Central Telegraph Office,
Janpath, Khurshidlal Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001. ... Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, M(J) :-

The applicant who is working as Telegraph Assistant with the respondents is aggrieved that although he was qualified to take the examination for promotion to the post of U.D.C. in terms of the order dated 11.6.1992 (Annexure-1), the respondents have not permitted him to do so. He submits that he made representations to the respondents on 5.9.1992 and 2.12.1992 but has received no reply. He also states that his case was being looked into.

2. The applicant has also filed an M.A. for condonation of delay in filing the O.A. in which he states that
- 18/

he had received a reply vide letter dated 22.8.1992 (Annexure-2). In this, the respondents have stated that since the applicant had not been found fit in terms of the order dated 3.2.1992, his request for taking the examination was rejected. The applicant states that he had filed a reply to this letter of 22.8.1992 and thereafter had been visiting a number of officials who had assured him that his case would be settled very soon. Since nothing has happened, hence, this application.

3. We have heard the applicant and have also perused the record,

4. We find that the application is hopelessly barred by time as the grievance of the applicant relates to his being rejected for appearing in the departmental examinations which were held in 1991 and 1992. The respondents have also conveyed their rejection to his representation vide their letter dated 22.8.1992.

It is settled law that repeated representations will not extend the period of limitation (State of Madhya Pradesh vs. S. S. Rathore : AIR 1990 SC 10). In the facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant ought to have approached this Tribunal for redressal of his grievance within the period of limitation as prescribed in Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, which he has failed to do.

5. The application for condonation of delay does not also give any sufficient ground for condonation. Hence, the M.A. is rejected.

18

5

- 3 -

6. In the result, this O.A. is dismissed at the admission stage itself on ground of limitation.

R. K. Ahooja
(R. K. Ahooja)
Member (A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

/as/