

(6)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

RA No.212/95 in OA No.987/95

Date of decision: 24.8.1995

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.C.MATHUR, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR.P.T.THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER(A)

Shri N.J.Singh
R/o 24/63-B, Tilak Nagar,
New Delhi-110018.

... Applicant

vs.

Union of India, through

1. Secretary to the Govt. of India
& Director General C.S.I.R.
Rafi Marg, New Delhi.
2. Joint Secretary (Admn.), C.S.I.R.,
Rafi Marg,
New Delhi.
3. Deputy Secretary (C.O.)
C.S.I.R.,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi.
4. Under Secretary, (C.O.), C.S.I.R.,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi. Respondents

ORDER (IN CIRCULATION)

JUSTICE S.C.MATHUR:

This review application is directed against our order dated 1.6.1995 whereby we dismissed applicant's OA No.987/95 on the ground of limitation.

2. In our order dated 1.6.1995 we had indicated that the cause of action accrued to the applicant on 1.1.1986 and the applicant's approach to the Tribunal through the Original Application filed on 23.5.1995 was inordinately delayed. In between these two dates, the applicant had preferred representations dated 12.3.1986, 8.7.1988, 24.2.1993 and 16.8.1993. We had observed that submission of repeated representations cannot extend the period of limitation. The applicant does not cite any authority of the Apex Court which takes the contrary view. Accordingly, it cannot be said that our judgement suffers from any apparent error.

✓

3. In ground (B), the applicant has stated that the settled legal position is that limitation starts from the date the representation is disposed of by a reasoned order. Although the applicant claims that this is the settled legal position, he has not cited any authority in support of the proposition. We are accordingly unable to accept the applicant's submission.

4. Our order, in our opinion, does not suffer from any apparent error to warrant its review. The application is accordingly rejected in circulation.

P. T. Thiruvengadam
24/6/95
(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)
MEMBER(A)

S. C. Mathur
(S.C. MATHUR)
CHAIRMAN