

(7)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A.No.458/94

New Delhi: this the 18<sup>th</sup> day of AUGUST, 1999.

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

HON'BLE MR. P. C. KANNAN, MEMBER (J)

Inspector Avtar Singh Parmar No. D/1310,

Delhi Police,

presently posted in Security, through

.... Applicant,

Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Advocate

Versus

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
through

Commissioner of Police,

Delhi Police,

Police Headquarters,

MSO Building,

I.P. Estate,

New Delhi -002.

2. Deputy Commissioner of Police ( HQ-1),  
Delhi Police, Police Headquarters,

MSO Building,

I.P. Estate,

New Delhi -002

.... Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri B. S. Gupta).

ORDER

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

Applicant impugns Rule 22 Delhi Police (Appointment & Recruitment) Rules, 1980 and seeks confirmation w.e.f. 1.8.77 with consequent seniority above his junior and other attendant benefits.

2. Respondents have raised the preliminary objection in their reply that the OA is hopelessly time barred and hit by limitation and lack of jurisdiction under the relevant provisions of the

(2)

(8)

A. T. Act.

3. Applicant in rejoinder has contended that his cause of action arise after one of his batchmates was given the benefit of an earlier order of the Tribunal dated 15.1.93. In Bhoop Singh Vs. UOI J.T. 1992 (3) SC 322 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that judgments and orders of the court in other cases do not give a cause of action which has to be reckoned from the actual date.

4. Respondents' preliminary objection is therefore sustained and the OA is dismissed. No costs.

Dhananjay

( P. C. KANNAN )  
MEMBER(J).

Adige

( S. R. ADIGE )  
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

/ug/