

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALIAHABAD BENCH,
ALLAHABAD

DATED ALLAHABAD THIS 23rd DAY OF JANUARY, 1996.

CORAM : Hon. Mr. Justice B. C. Saksena, V.C.
Hon. Mr. S. Das Gupta, Member-A.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 1886 of 1994.

1. Man Singh Yadav, son of Sri Ram Avtar, Resident of village and Post Office Mohamabad, District Etawah.
2. Ram Swarup Yadav, son of Sri Hom Singh Yadav, Resident of village Chaturipur, Post Office Chandesu, District Mainpuri.
3. Shiv Kumar son of Sri Layak Singh Resident of village Bhadmai, Post Office Salempur, District Aligarh.
4. Hitendra Kumar Sharma, son of Sri Dev Dutta, resident of 2/216, Shyam Nagar, District Aligarh.
5. Pradeep Kumar son of Sri Bal Krishna, R/o. Ho No. 40, Siknopangali, Hathras, District Aligarh.
6. Nagesh Kumar Gupta, son of Sri Raghbir Prasad Gupta, resident of village and Post Office Fappal, District Aligarh.
7. Mahesh Pal Singh son of Sri Ram Singh, Resident of village and Post Office Hitali, Hiran Singh, District Aligarh.
8. Pran Chandra, son of Sri Shiv Lal, C/o. S.S.Ravat, O/o. the D.E.T.Agra.
9. Satya Prakash Sharma, son of Sri Tej Pal Sharma, Resident of village and Post Office (Via Lodha), District Aligarh. Applicants.

(BY ADVOCATE SHRI I.C.PANDEY & SRI S.N.SRIVASTAVA)

Versus

1. Union of India, ~~xxxxxx~~ Ministry of

1 Bch

Communications (Dept. of Posts)
New Delhi, through its Secretary,

2. Director General, Department of Posts,
New Delhi.
3. Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Aligarh Division, Aligarh.
4. Senior Post Master (G), Aligarh,
Head Post Office, Aligarh.

..... Respondents.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon. Mr. Justice B. C. Saksena, V.C.)

Order sheet discloses that it was pointed out to the learned counsel for the applicant that the cause of action in this O.A. appears to have arisen several years back. The applicants ~~may~~ ^{claim} for equal pay for equal work for the period between 1983 to 1987. The learned counsel for the applicants sought time to file a delay condonation application, but the same has not been done. On the last date on 1.12.1995 last opportunity was given and it was provided that if the order dated 5.1.1994 is not complied with before the next date, the application shall stand dismissed.

2. It is fairly well settled ~~that~~ on the basis of several decisions that a judgment of Court/Tribunal, does not afford a fresh cause of action to any non-petitioner. The cause of action has to be computed on the basis of the period for which the claim relates.

3. We accordingly dismiss the O.A. as being time-barred.

W.R.
Member-(A)

B.C.
Vice-Chairman

DATED : ALLAHABAD 23rd Jan. 1996.