

A2
1

(R)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH.

O.A. No. 777 of 1989

Dated: 24.1.1995

Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, A.M.
Hon. Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, J.M.

Rafique Hussain Rizvi, son of late
Sayed Kazim Hussain, Resident of Village
Husainpur Bibipur, P.O. Kichaucha,
District Faizabad. Applicant.

(By Advocate Sri V.K. Srivastava)

Versus

1. Union of India through its G.M.
N. Rly. Head Quarter Baroda
House, New Delhi.
2. D.R.M. N. Railway,
Hazratganj, Lucknow.
3. Senior Loco Inspector, Diesel Incharge,
N. Railway, Diesel Shed Mughalsarai,
Varanasi. RESPONDENTS.

ORDER

(By Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member(A))

Heard Sri V.K. Srivastava, learned counsel for
the applicant. On 25.2.1991, when the case came up
for admission, it was noted that statement of facts
in the O.A. is not complete and a lot of relevant
details have not been set out ~~been~~ therein. The
applicant was given last opportunity to get the
petition amended and to annex relevant orders and
circulars by 8.4.1991. Thereafter, another opportuni-
ty was granted to the applicant to comply with the

W.L.

(6)

- 2 -

said direction. The applicant thereafter has filed M.P. No. 1916 of 1991 purporting to give more details relevant to this case. We have gone through the submissions made both in the O.A. and in the M.P. No. 1916 of 1991. The applicant claims that a Projector Operator in Diesel Training School, Northern Railway. He also claims that the appropriate scale for this post is Rs. 330-480 as recommended by the Third Pay Commission but the said scale has not been given to him despite the issuance of a latter by G.M.(P) New Delhi in this regard.

2. The applicant has not annexed any document to show that the pay scale recommended for the post of Projector Operation is Rs. 330-480 nor has he annexed the order stated to have been issued by the G.M.(P) New Delhi. The basis of the claim has, therefore, not been established. Moreover, the cause of action would have arisen in the year 1974 as stated by the applicant himself and repeated representations thereafter cannot extend the period of limitation. Thus, the application is also time barred.

3. In view of the foregoing, the application is dismissed as ~~being~~ devoid of merits and time barred.

J. ... 83
Member (J)
(n.o.)

R. ...
Member (A)