

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Jaipur Bench, Jaipur**

O.A. No.538/2016

Reserved on: 11.08.2021
Pronounced on: 17.08.2021

**Hon'ble Mr. Dinesh Sharma, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mrs. Hina P. Shah, Member (J)**

Bidha Ram Dagur S/o Mitthan Lal Age about : 54 Resident of 23/101 Madina Colony Dholpur (Rj) now working as PA Sambhar Lake Head Post Office Gr 'C' ...Applicant.

(Applicant in person)

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary & Director General, Ministry of Communication and Department of Posts Dak Bhawan Marg, New Delhi-110001.
2. The Chief Post Master General Rajasthan Circle Jaipur-302007.
3. The Supdt. Of Post Offices Dholpur DN Dholpur-328001.

...Respondents.

(By Advocate: Shri Abhishek Sharma)

ORDER

Per: Dinesh Sharma, Member (A):

In this OA, the applicant has prayed for quashing the impugned order dated 17.03.2016 (Annexure A/1) by which his request for grant of TA etc. was rejected "as time barred and without going into the merit of the case".

(2)

2. The applicant has stated that he has not been granted accommodation for unavailed transit period in the leave account in relation to his transfer in the year 1983 and similar benefits with respect to his transfer in the year 2001 and 2005. He has also claimed for sanctioning his TA bills relating to his transfer in the year 2005 and 2010. All these requests have been rejected as being barred by time by the respondents. The applicant has stated that he is entitled to all the benefits. The rejection on the ground of these being time barred is illegal and the same therefore be aside.

3. The respondents have filed a reply stating that all these claims are time barred and the TA claims should be made within one year of the rising of the claim. Since the applicant's claims relate to a period, in some cases, for grant of claims one or two decades back, these cannot be accepted and have been rightly rejected as time barred.

4. The applicant has also annexed copies of letters acknowledging receipt of his transfer TA bills relating to the year 2005 (Annexure A/13).

5. We have heard the matter through video conferencing on 11.08.2021. It is clear the claims relate to his transfers some of which happened one or two decades before this OA

(3)

is filed. The claim relating to transfer of 2005, even if it is found to have been made within one year period, cannot be agitated before this Tribunal in the year 2016 when this OA has been filed. Hence, we agree with the contention of the respondents that these claims are hopelessly barred by time and deserve to be rejected on that account.

6. Even a cursory look at the claims made in the OA makes it apparent that there is not even *prima facie* merit in the substantive claims of the applicant. Hence, the OA is dismissed both on merits and also because of it being filed much after the period limitation prescribed under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. No costs.

(Hina P. Shah)
Member (J)

(Dinesh Sharma)
Member (A)

/kdr/