

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

10

R.A.NO. 102/90 in
O.A.NO. 984/90

DATE OF ORDER: 28.02.1992.

SH. ASHOK KUMAR BAGHEL VS. UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS.

O R D E R

This review application was filed against our judgement dated 29.5.1990, in O.A.No.984/90, whereby, we had dismissed the O.A., primarily on the ground of limitation. After filing of the present R.A., instead of deciding the same, by circulation, in terms of Rule 17(2) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, after perusal of the contents of the review application, we issued a notice to the other side, and decided to hear the applicant, in the present R.A. On issue of notice to the respondents, a reply has also been filed, on behalf of the respondents.


2. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and have also carefully perused the submissions made therein, and also the ground taken up by the respondents, in their reply to the review application.


3. The learned counsel for the applicant, by referring to some of the rulings, mentioned in the application itself, prayed that too technical view of dismissing the O.A. on the ground of limitation, should not be resorted to and that, in the interest of justice, by granting

Seen

the present review application, the main O.A. filed by the applicant, be dealt with, in accordance with law.

4. We have given our careful consideration to what has been submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant, together with his submissions made in the review application. As earlier mentioned in our order dated 29.5.1990, the delay is quite substantial, ranging ~~over~~ a period of 2 years and 3 months, approximately. The applicant has attributed this delay to his counsel, who did not inform him of the judgement passed by the Industrial Tribunal concerned, on the matter having been finally decided by the said Tribunal. This, to our mind, in itself shows that the applicant did not pursue his case with due diligence. To say the least, we do not find any good ground to grant the present review application, and for that matter, to take up afresh, the O.A. filed by the applicant. As a result of the above discussion, this review application is dismissed with no order as to costs.


(I.K. RASGOTRA)
MEMBER(A)


(T.S. OBEROI)
MEMBER(J)