

(2)

In The Central Administrative Tribunal
ALLAHABAD BENCH

:: ORDER - SHEET ::

60/95

Application No.... of 199

Applicant (s)

Respondent (s)

Advocate for Applicant (s)

Advocate for Respondent (s)

| Notes of the Registry | Orders of the Tribunal |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p><u>20/7/2000</u></p> <p>Hon'ble Mr. S.K.I. Naqvi, J.M.</p> <p><u>Hon'ble Mr. S. Biswas, A.M.</u></p> <p>Sri B. Tewari, for applicant. Heard.</p> <p>This O.A. was dismissed on 22.9.95^{22.9.95} and the M.A. has been filed on 26.5.2000 that is ^{after} more than ^{four} 4 and a half years. The reason for the delay ^{is} as mentioned in the affidavit filed along with delay condonation that is M.A. 2982/2000 that the learned counsel who was conducting the matter could not attend on the dates fixed in the O.A. and ^{when} then the applicant approached him to know about the progress of the case, the learned counsel returned back the file. This practice to shift responsibility on the counsel and bring him in the dark of misconduct is to be deprecated and we do not wish to encourage it. You ^{are} are not satisfied with the ^{given} grounds to condone the delay of more than 4½ ^{years} weeks and reject the application No. 2982/2000 and consequently the restoration Application No. 2981/2000 also fails.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">S.R. A.M.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">S.R. J.M.</p> <p>/T. Joshi/</p> |