

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.210/187/2021
(with MA No.210/181/2021)**

Dated this Wednesday, the 03rd day of March, 2021

**CORAM: DR. BHAGWAN SAHAI, MEMBER (A)
RAVINDER KAUR, MEMBER (J)**

**Proceeding conducted through video conferencing with
the consent of applicant's counsel.**

Mr. Somnath Yashwant Shirsat, Age 48 years,
Occupation : Employee, Currency Note Press,
Resident of N-8/E-1/30/4, Ganesh Chowk,
New Cidco, Nashik 422 009, District Nashik.
(By Advocate Shri Mayur A. Jadhav)

- Applicant

Versus

1. The Union of India, Finance Department, Rajpath Marg,
E Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi, Delhi 110 011.
2. The Currency Note Press, Currency Note Press, Jail Road,
Nashik Road, Nashik 422 101.
3. The Works Manager, Currency Note Press, Jail Road,
Nashik Road, Nashik 422 101.
4. The Asst. Manager, HRD, Currency Note Press, Jail Road,
Nashik Road, Nashik 422 101.

- Respondents

ORAL ORDER

Per : Dr. Bhagwan Sahai, Member (A)

Present:

Advocate Shri Mayur A. Jadhav for the applicant.

2. Heard him on admission of the OA.
3. In this OA the applicant seeks setting aside of order dated 20.01.2001 issued by Works Manager, Currency Note Press, Nashik Road, Nashik. Shri Jadhav submits that a Criminal case No.60/1995 under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code was lodged against the applicant, in which he was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for five years and to pay Rs.500/- . However, in the Criminal Appeal No.451/1995 filed by him, by the Bombay High Court order dated 26.06.2019, he was acquitted and thereafter he has been making representations but he has still not been reinstated in service.
4. For condoning delay in filing the OA against the dismissal order of 20.01.2001, the applicant has submitted MA No.181/2021 mentioning that there is delay of 7595 days in filing this OA. Shri Jadhav pleads that the

applicant did not approach the Tribunal earlier because he was waiting for the High Court decision on his Criminal Appeal and after the High Court decision of 26.06.2015 became available, he submitted representation to the respondents for his reinstatement in service in March 2016, July 2019 and March 2020.

5. However, the only justification in this application mentioned by him is that the delay is not willful, deliberate and intentional, and therefore it should be condoned.

6. We have considered this MA filed by the applicant for condoning the delay of 19 years. However, we do not find any justification in this MA and during submission of the applicant's counsel for this long unjustified delay. Even after the High Court order of June 2015 became available to him and there was no response to his representations of 2016 and 2019, he kept silent. Therefore, in view of absence of any justification submitted by the applicant for the long delay, his application for condoning it is rejected.

7. Since it is clear from the OA and submissions of the applicant's counsel that after the impugned order of the respondents dated 20.01.2001 dismissing him from service with immediate effect, the applicant has not made any sincere efforts to challenge that order of the respondents. Therefore, his claim for reinstatement after 20 years from his dismissal has become a totally stale claim which cannot be entertained.

8. In view of no justification for the long delay and no merit in the OA, we dismiss it at admission stage. No costs.

(Ravinder Kaur)
Member (Judicial)

(Dr. Bhagwan Sahai)
Member (Administrative)

kmg*

20/03/21