

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA 28/96 in
CP 59/96 in
OA 844/91

(23)

New Delhi this the 24th Day of February, 1997

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)
Hon'ble Shri K. Muthukumar, Member (A)

Union of India through
the Chief Administrative Officer (R)
Diesel Component Works,
Patiala.

(By Advocate Shri P.S. Mahendru) ... Applicant

Vs.

Shri Rakesh Malik
s/o Sh. R. A. Malik
Ex-Tool Checker
Plant Maintenance Shop
Diesel Component Works,
Patiala.
Presently
Railway Quarter No. 3/11,
Delhi Kishanganj,
Delhi.

... Respondent

(By Advocate Shri B.S. Maini through
proxy counsel Shri Madhok)

ORDER (ORAL)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))

We have heard Shri P.S. Mahendru, learned counsel who has pressed RA 28/96 along with MA 414/96 for condonation of delay.

2. Regarding the question of delay, we note that the respondents have themselves admitted that the RA ought to have been filed by 4.7.95. However, they have submitted that an earlier MA filed by them (MA 2406/95) was disposed of vide order dated 8.1.1996 and thereafter this RA has been filed on 9.2.1996. ^{However, from P.S.} Considering these facts, we are not satisfied that there are sufficient reasons for condoning the delay in this case.

3. Apart from the above, the applicants (Original respondents) in the R.A. ~~have~~ have also not shown as to how there appears to be an error apparent on the face of the record in the impugned order dated 16.5.95 in OA 844/91. We, therefore,

18.

allowable *18-*
find no good ground to ~~reject~~ this R.A.

24

4. For the above reasons, this R.A. is accordingly dismissed.

5. Shri P.S. Mahandru, learned counsel submits that in view of the above, further two months time may be granted to the respondents to comply with the directions in OA 844/91 dated 16.5.1995. That prayer is allowed.

Muthukumar
(K. Muthukumar)
Member (A)

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)