

3

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

O.A. No.
~~T.A. No.~~

911

1986

DATE OF DECISION 7-1-1987

Sri Arjun Prasad Singh

Petitioner

J. L. Sharma

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India

Respondent

-

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM :

◆ **The Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice Chairman**

The Hon'ble Mr. Birbal Nath, Member (AM)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?

JUDGMENT

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman: In this application made under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act') the applicant has challenged Order No.F.11/185/83-Ad.1B(Per) dated 29-9-1983 (Annexure-D) made by Government. In the said order, Government has terminated the services of the applicant in accordance with Rule 5 of the Central Civil Services (Temporary Services) Rules, 1965 ('the Rules'). We have no doubt that this order had been served on the applicant within a

(u)

a few days from the date of the order.

2. The applicant has presented this application before this Tribunal on 30-9-1986 that is after three years the order was made by Government. In I.A.No.I filed under Section 21(3) of the Act, the applicant has sought for condoning the delay in making the application under Section 19 of the Act. The one and the only reason stated in I.A.No.I is that the applicant had misplaced the papers and with considerable difficulty he had secured copy of the order. We seriously doubt the correctness of the statements made by the applicant in I.A.No.I and the affidavit. If that is so, we cannot hold that the applicant had made out a sufficient cause for condonation of delay. We will also assume that every one of the facts stated in I.A.No.I and in his affidavit as correct. Even so, every one of the facts stated by the applicant do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay in making the application.

3. We are of the view that this is not a fit case in which this Tribunal should interfere with an order made as early as on 29-9-1983.

4. In the light of our above discussion, we hold that I.A.No.I and the application are liable to be rejected. We, therefore, reject I.A.No.I and the application.

K.S. Puttaswamy
(K.S. PUTTASWAMY)
VICE-CHAIRMAN
7/1/87

Birbal Nath
(BIRBAL NATH)
MEMBER (AM)
7/1/87

np/