

②  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.NO. 2567/96

Hon<sup>o</sup>ble Mr. Justice B.C.Saksena, Chairman  
Hon<sup>o</sup>ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this 9th day of January, 1997

S.C.Sharma  
Superintendent(Admn.)  
District East  
Directorate of Education  
Government of NCT of Delhi  
Delhi.

... Applicant

(By Shri J.M.L.Kaushik, Advocate)

Vs.

Govt. of National Capital Territory of Delhi

1. Govt. of National Capital Territory of Delhi  
through Chief Secretary, Delhi  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
(Cadre Controlling Authority).

2. Principal Secretary(Services I Deptt.)  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi (Joint Seniority Cell)  
5, Sham Nath Marg  
DELHI - 6.

3. Director of Education  
Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Old Secretariat  
DELHI.

.... Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

Hon<sup>o</sup>ble Mr. Justice B.C.Saksena, Chairman

We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant. The applicant was communicated certain adverse entries in the ACR for the period 01.04.1986 to 31.03.1987 on 30.9.1988. According to him he was eligible to be considered for the post of Grade-I Subordinate Service(DASS) Group 'B' against the vacancy for the year 1989. The applicant was duly considered against the said vacancy when the DPC met in the year 1992. The impugned order shows that the DPC did not find the applicant fit for promotion.

Contd....2/-

(4)

His case for promotion was again considered in the year 1993 and having been found fit, he was promoted in the year 1993.

2. The applicant through this OA seeks that his promotion on the post of Grade I DASS cadre under Rule 6 of the Delhi Administration Subordinate Services Rule 1967 should be with effect from 07.07.1989. He also indirectly challenges the adverse entries communicated in the year 1988, which resulted in his not being fit for promotion against the 1989 vacancy when the DPC met in the year 1990. The OA has been filed on 09.12.1996 after a lapse of almost eight years from the date the adverse entries were communicated to him.

3. In view of the above, we do not find good ground to condone the delay for filing the OA. The OA is clearly barred by time and laches. It is accordingly dismissed.

*R.K. Ahodja*  
(R.K. AHODJA)  
MEMBER (A)

*B.C. Saksena*  
(B.C. SAKSENA)  
CHAIRMAN

/rao/