

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

15

OA No. 2609/97.

New Delhi, this the 7th day of December, 1998

HON'BLE SHRI R.K.AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

Shri Jagdish s/o Shri Munshi Ram,
c/o Mehar Chand S/o Sh. Ram Nand,
Baragi, village Shahabad Mohammed,
New Delhi.Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri T.D. Yadav)

Versus

Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi through

1. The Chief Engineer, PWD Zone-2,
MSO Building, New Delhi.
2. Superintending Engineer,
PWD Circle - 3,
MSO Building, New Delhi.
3. The Executive Engineer,
PWD Divn. No. 27,
Govt. of NCTD,
New Delhi.

Respondents

(By Advocate; Shri Rajinder Pandita)

O R D E R (ORAL)

by Hon'ble Shri R.K. Ahooja, Member (A):

Applicant who claims to have worked as casual Mason in PWD Divn. No. 27, Delhi Administration from Feb., 1984 to June, 1986 has come to the Tribunal seeking a direction to the respondents to re-engage him in preference to outsiders and juniors and to regularise his services as per law. The claim is denied by the respondents who submit that applicant had worked from Feb., 1984 to June, 1985 only.


2. I have heard the learned counsel on either side. I find that the objection raised by the respondents that the OA suffers from limitation is justified. Learned

me

(1b)

Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been making repeated representations and he has been told that his case would be considered as and when the ban on engaging fresh casual labourers is lifted. He argued that the applicant cannot be treated as ^athe case of fresh appointment as he had already worked for two years with the respondents. However, repeated representations do not extend the time of limitation. The time frame in which he has approached the Tribunal after a lapse of more than 10 years also gives strength to the objection raised by the respondents that the applicant had left the work on his own. The explanation that the applicant being an illiterate person cannot be expected to be aware of the legal situation cannot ^{be}treated as an adequate explanation considering the long lapse of time since his last engagement with the respondents.

3. In the result this OA is dismissed as barred by limitation. No costs.


(R. K. Ahooja)

Member (A)