

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
NEW DELHI

OA/TAR/ACC No. 534/91 19

Pushkar Nath Ganjoo  
APPLICANT(S) COUNSELVERSUS  
UOI  
RESPONDENT(S) COUNSEL

Date	Office Report	Orders
	9.  <u>5.4.1991</u>  Present : Applicant in person.  We have heard the applicant in person. The case is barred by limitation and no satisfactory explanation for the delay in coming to the court is available except that a final answer by the respondents has been given to him on 5th December, 1990 which is in reference to his representation dated 7th November, 1990. <sup>2</sup> The perusal of the representation of 7th November, 1990 shows that he had made representations earlier on 4th January, 1988, 25th May, 1988, 10th November, 1988 and 18th January, 1989. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified that the clock of limitation starts clicking from the date when cause of action arose and not from the date when the representation <del>made</del> , is finally decided by the competent authority. The applicant should wait only for six months and come to the court. Repeated representations do not extend the limitation. In the <del>phase</del> face of specific provisions made in the Central	...2...

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p>Administrative Tribunals Act, the application is, therefore, barred by limitation and dismissed accordingly.</p> <p><i>Danu</i> (J.P. SHARMA) MEMBER (J)</p> <p><i>Subrata</i> (I.K. RASGOTRA) MEMBER (A)</p>