

In The Central Administrative Tribunal

2

ALLAHABAD BENCH

:: ORDER - SHEET ::

Applicant (s)

Respondent (s)

Advocate for Applicant (s)

Advocate for Respondent (s)

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>28/7/2000</u></p> <p><u>Hon'ble Mr. S.K.I. Naqvi, J.M.</u></p>
	<p>Heard Sri Rakesh Verma for applicant, and Sri Prashant Mathur, for respondent. In this case the O.A. was dismissed in default of the appearance of the applicant on 07.05.1999 and the M.A. has been filed on 10.8.1999. There is also a prayer to condone the delay and it has been mentioned that it was only on 10.8.1999, when he came to know the fate of the case and he immediately moved the restoration application. The perusal on record does not support this condonation of the applicant because the date when the O.A. was dismissed that is 07.05.1999 was adjourned from preceeding date on 31.3.1999. When it was brought adjourned ^{adjournment from Single} on the ground of illness that counsel for applicant and it was become ^{encountered} incompetent upon the learned counsel to ascertain the adjourned date. Moreover, at that stage it was for final hearing. It also does not ^{not} need to be mentioned that knowledge to the counsel is deemed knowledge to the applicant and moreover not to gather information, only to plead ignorance, can also not be a ^{an} acceptable defence.</p>
	<p><u>For the above</u> <u>Further</u> as I find the restoration application has been filed much beyond the time allowed for the purpose and therefore dismissed accordingly.</p> <p>No order as to cost.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">J.M.</p>

/ T. Joshi /