

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI**

R.A. No. 221/1994 in  
OA No. 1463/90

Decided on 4.7.94.

Bharat Vs. Union of India & Another

O R D E R

This R.A. has been filed by the applicant in OA No. 1463/90 which was decided by order dated 25.10.90, as on 3.6.94. As the R.A. has not been filed within the period of limitation of 30 days as prescribed under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, the applicant has also filed MA 1746/94 seeking condonation of delay in filing this R.A.

2. It is, inter alia, stated in the M.A. for condonation of delay that the applicant engaged Shri G.S. Beqrar, Advocate who applied for a certified copy on 5.5.94, which was supplied to him on 23.5.94 and as such the present review application is filed without any delay on the part of the applicant. There is nothing else in this M.A. on the point of delay in filing the R.A. The report of the Registry shows that copy of the judgement dated 25.10.90 was sent to the counsel for the applicant by Registered A.D. on 5.11.90 and that neither the copy was received un-served nor A.D. in token of

delivery of the letter was received. Hence, it has to be presumed that copy of the judgement dated 25.10.90 was delivered to the counsel for the applicant in the O.A. The mere fact that he again applied through his new counsel for a certified copy of the judgement does not mean that copy of the judgement was not earlier delivered to his counsel as already referred to above. Thus, the review applicant has failed to show any cause, what to say 'sufficient cause' for the delay of more than 3½ years in filing this R.A. The M.A. 1463/90 has to be rejected and is accordingly, rejected.

3. In view of the above, this R.A. is also rejected as not maintainable in view of the provisions of Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987. By circulation.

J. P. Sharma  
( J.P. Sharma )  
Member (J)

C. C.  
( P.C. Jain )  
Vice-Chairman  
Chandigarh Bench