

(A)

In the Central Administrative Tribunal

Principal Bench: New Delhi

OA No. 1968/92

Date of decision: 26.03.1993.

MP 2234/92

Shri Nanhey

...Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

...Respondents

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)  
The Hon'ble Mr. C.J. Roy, Member (J)

For the applicant

Shri B.K. Batra, Counsel.

For the respondents

Shri H.K. Gangwani, Counsel.

Judgement(Oral)  
(Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member(A))

Heard.

The case of the petitioner is that his services were dispensed with as a casual labour on 14.8.1985 when he was working under I.O.W. Gajrola and that respondents have since then not called him back to duty. He further submitted that in accordance with Railway Board's instructions his name should have been kept on the live casual labour register and work offered to him as and when the vacancy arose.

2. The petitioner has also filed an MP for condonation of delay. We have perused the said MP carefully and we do not find sufficient reason for condoning the delay in approaching the Tribunal. As earlier said, the petitioner was discharged from service in August, 1985 while he has filed this O.A. only on 29.7.1992. The petitioner, therefore, is highly belated and barred by limitation under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, prayed that the respondents should be directed to keep the petitioner at least on the live casual labour register.

Since the matter is time barred, we are not persuaded to issue any direction to the respondents. However, if the petitioner files a representation with the respondents, the respondents may consider to place his name on the live casual labour register in accordance with the rules. With the above observations the OA is dismissed. No costs.

*erst Roy*  
(C.J. ROY)  
MEMBER(J)

*S. Sengupta*  
(I.K. RASGOTRA)  
MEMBER(A)

San.