

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

RA No.364/92 in  
OA-1910/88

New Delhi this the 29th Day of April, 1994.

Sh. N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman (A)  
Shri C.J. Roy, Member (J)

Mukesh Kumar  
S/o Sh. Dinesh Chand Tyagi,  
R/o Vill. & P.O. Kharkhoda,  
Distt. Meerut (UP) ...Applicant

(By Advocate Sh. M.P. Raju, proxy counsel for Sh. J.P. Verghese, counsel).

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. The Lt. Governor, Delhi through Chief Secretary, Delhi Admn. Delhi.
3. The Commissioner of Police Delhi, Delhi Police Headquarters, M.S.O. Building, I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
4. Addl. Commissioner of Police (AP), Delhi Police Headquarters, M.S.O. Building I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
5. D.C.P. III Bn. DAP, New Police Lines, K.W. Camp, Delhi. ...Respondents

(By Advocate Ms. Ashoka Jain)

ORDER(ORAL)

Mr. N.V. Krishnan:

The review applicant has filed MP-3712/92 for condoning the delay in filing the Review Application. The judgement was delivered on 25.3.92. The review should have been filed on 25.4.92 but it has been filed on 26.8.92. It is stated that the applicant came to know about the judgement only on 20.4.92 when a copy of the judgement sent by his counsel reached him by post. Thereafter, it is stated that the applicant was unwell and he was not in a position to travel because of his

ill health and, therefore, he could not contact his counsel.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. The learned counsel for the applicant states that these are sufficient grounds to condone the delay. We are of the view that some part of the delay is attributable to the counsel. MP should be supported by an affidavit of the counsel. It is further stated that the applicant was advised by the Doctor to take complete bed rest. This contention is also not supported by the medical certificate. In the circumstance, we are satisfied that no sufficient cause has been shown by the review applicant to condone the delay. The learned counsel for the applicant requests that a week's time may be given to him to produce these records. We are of the view that the applicant should have annexed all these documents alongwith the MP. The prayer of additional time is, therefore, not granted. MP for condonation of delay is dismissed. Accordingly, the R.A. automatically stands dismissed.

(C.J. Roy)  
Member(J)

Sanju.

(N.V. Krishnan)  
Vice-Chairman

29.4.94