

2

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
OA. No.841/95  
MA No.1033/95

Hon'ble Shri A.V.Haridasan, Vice-Chairman(J)  
Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

New Delhi, this 12 day of <sup>June</sup> May, 1995

Shri K.L.Rangeen,  
s/o Shri Salig Ram  
4/62, Old Rajinder Nagar  
New Delhi-60. .... Applicant

(By Shri D.R.Gupta, Advocate)

Versus

Union of India-through:

The Secretary  
Ministry of Human Resources Development  
Department of Education  
Shastri Bhawan  
New Delhi.

Lt. Governor Delhi  
Delhi Administration  
Arya Niwas Marg  
Delhi.

Chief Secretary  
Delhi Administration  
Shyam Nath Marg  
Delhi

Director of Education  
Delhi Administration  
Old Sectt.,  
Alipure Road  
Delhi.

.... Respondents

(None)

O R D E R

Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Hon'ble Member(A)

The applicant claims that he had been discharging the duties of Post Graduate Teacher (Drawing) since 1.10.1964. The scale applicable for such P.G. Teachers at that time was Rs.250-470. He was however, fitted in a lower scale and was given the benefit of the PGT scale only from 3.1.1974. This OA has been filed for the conferment of the higher scale for the period from 1.10.1964 to 2.1.1974, by extending the

benefits of the judgment dated 5.1.1994 of the High Court of Delhi in LPA of 73/80 in the matter of Shri R.Khan Versus MCD & Others, Delhi Administration.

2. At the stage of admission, we took up for consideration the issue regarding limitation. The learned counsel for the applicant argued that the benefit claimed has been given in the case of another teacher junior to the applicant in pursuance to the orders of the Delhi High Court, referred herein. The applicant had represented for a similar benefit but the respondents have not replied to him. It is the case of the applicant that the cause of action arose on 5.1.1994 and hence, this OA cannot be barred by limitation.

3. We are not convinced by the argument of the learned counsel for the applicant. Hon'ble Supreme Court had held in Bhoop Singh Vs. UOI {JT 1992(3) SC 322} that the judgment and orders of court in other cases do not give cause of action.

4. In Ex. cap. Harish Uppal Vs. UOI {JT 1994(3) 126}, the Apex Court has observed that the parties should pursue their rights and remedies promptly and not sleep over them. If they choose to sleep over their rights and remedies, the court may well choose to decline to interfere in its discretionary jurisdiction.

4

5. We note that the grievances of the **petitioners** arose in the year 1964 and may have persisted till 1974. The applicant had chosen to agitate the matter only now, in this OA after a gap of more than 20 years. We do not see any reason for condoning the delay.

6. In the circumstances, the MA for condonation of delay is rejected and the OA is dismissed in Limine.

*P. T. Thiru*  
1/6/75  
(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)  
Member (A)

*A. V. Haridasan*  
(A.V. HARIDASAN)  
Vice-Chairman (J)

/RAO/