

(2)

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

RA No.114 of 1996 in OA 1114/96.

New Delhi this the 06 day of September 1996.

Hon'ble Mr A.V.Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)
Hon'ble Mr R.K.Ahooja, Member (A)

Sh.C.H.Sharma
S/o Sh. S.N.Sharma
R/o Flat No. 1059, Gulabi Bagh
Delhi - 110 007.

...Applicant.

(By Sh.G.D.Gupta, advocate)

Versus

Union of India through

1. Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs
North Block
Central Secretariat
New Delhi.
2. Govt. of NCT of Delhi
through its Chief Secretary
5, Alipur Road
Delhi.
3. The Deputy Commissioner of Police
New Courts, Tis Hazari
Delhi.

...Respondents.

O R D E R

Hon'ble Mr A.V.Haridasan, Vice Chairman (J)

The applicant in OA No. 1114/96 has filed this Review Application seeking a review of the order passed on 27th May 1996 in the OA. The reliefs sought in the OA were all relating to grievances which arose during 1961, 1963, 1968, 1969, 1988 and 1990. The OA was filed on 14th May 1996. As the Tribunal didn't have the jurisdiction to entertain any application in regard to grievances which arose more than 3 years prior to the commencement of the Administrative Tribunals


Act, in regard to such reliefs, the Bench observed that the application could not be admitted for want of jurisdiction. In regard to rest of the claims, as it was barred by limitation, the application could not be entertained. In ~~the~~ MA filed along with the OA for condonation of delay, ~~it~~ did not disclose any valid reason to condone the delay. Under the circumstances, the OA as also the MA for condonation of delay were rejected and the matter was disposed of under Section 19 (3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act. It is that order which is sought to be reviewed. It is averred in the RA that the Tribunal did not take note of the observation in the order of the High Court of Delhi in dismissing the CP that it was open for the applicant to approach appropriate authority in regard to his grievance and that before filing the OA, the applicant had caused a lawyer notice to be issued to the respondents. If this was taken into account, the review applicant contends that the application would not have been rejected under Section 19 (3) of the Adminsitrative Tribunals Act.


2. Going though the averments in the OA, the material placed on record, the order sought to be reviewed and the allegations in the RA, we find absolutely no reason to review the order. In the order of the CP, it has not been mentioned that the applicant would be entitled to claim reliefs in regard to matters which are barred by limitation.

6

Causing a lawyer notice to be issued after a long gap of time also does not revive the cause of action which is time barred. We do not find any error apparent on the face of record or any other valid ground for review of the order. The RA is therefore, dismissed.

A copy of the order may be given to the applicant.


(R.K. Ahooja)
Member (A)


(A.V. Haridasan)
Vice Chairman (J)

aa.