

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

RA NO. 233/99 IN  
OA NO. 365/95

17

New Delhi. this the 25th day of October, 2000

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)  
HON'BLE MR. GOVINDAN S. TAMPI, MEMBER (A)

In the matter of:

C.P.Saxena.  
J-234. Patel Nagar-I,  
Ghaziabad-201002.  
(By Advocate: Sh. G.K.Agarwalla)

VS.

1. Union of India through  
Secretary, Deptt. Expenditure.  
(North Block). New Delhi-1.
2. Union of India through  
Secretary Deptt. Pers. & Trg.  
North Block. New Delhi-1.  
(By Advocate: Sh. R.V.Sinha)

ORDER (ORAL)

By Mr. Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy,

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the  
respondents.

2. In this RA the applicant herein, is the applicant in the  
OA. This application is filed to review the order passed by  
the Tribunal dismissing the OA. Two errors are pointed out by  
the learned counsel for the applicant.

(i) It is argued that the limitation for  
filing the OA starts not with reference to  
the first representation but with reference  
to the reply that was given with regard to  
the reply given to it even though it was  
given much beyond 6 months from the date of  
representation. We do not agree. Learned

g✓

counsel relies upon S.S.Rathore vs. State of M.P. reported in 1989 (4) SCC 582. We have perused the case. We are of the view that it would not support the contention of the learned counsel. AB

(ii) The second error that was pointed out is that the applicant has been promoted to UDC on 1.10.79 and not 25.3.81 but the Court dismissed the OA on the ground that he was promoted on 25.3.81. This objection is substantively erroneous according to the learned counsel. But the applicant himself has given the date of promotion in the OA as well as in Annexure 4 as 25.3.81.

3. In view of the above rejecting both the contentions the RA is dismissed with cost of Rs.1000/-.

( GOVINDAN S. TAMPI )  
Member (A)  
'sd'

*Om Agarwal*  
( V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY )  
Vice Chairman (J)