

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD

Allahabad this the 19th day of March, 2001

C O R A M :- Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member- A.

Orginal Application No. 172 of 1999

Laxmi Kant Shukla S/o Sri Yagul Kishore,  
C/o Sri Rajnaraain Tripathi. Vill. Durga Shukla Ka Pura  
P.O. Barai-Harrik. Distt. Allahabad.

.....Applicant

Counsel for the applicant:- Sri K.S. Saxena

V E R S U S

1. The Union of India through the General Manager  
Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Northern Rly. Allahabad.
3. The General Manager, Northern Central Rly.  
Allahabad.

.....Respondents

Counsel for the respondents:- Sri A.K. Gaur.

O R D E R (Oral)

(By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member- A.)

This application has been filed for re-engagement/  
regularisation of the applicant as casual labour under the  
D.R.M, Allahabad as per rules.

2. The case of the applicant is that he was engaged  
as casual labour for total of 214 days in the year 1977-78  
and for 30 days from 01.09.78 to 30.09.78. He claims that

he is entitled to the entry of his name in the Live  
he  
Casual Labour Register as/ has worked for more than  
120 days prior to 1978. The applicant made applications  
for being appointed as casual labour which were replied  
to vide letter dt. 22.12.97 and 12.12.98 by the respondents.

3. I have heard Sri K.S. Saxena, learned counsel for  
the applicant and Sri A.K. Gaur, learned counsel for the  
respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has drawn my  
attention to the reply dt. 12.12.98 in which respondents  
have denied that since the applicant's name was not  
included in any Live Casual Labour Register nor it is  
included in the computerised list of casual labourers, it  
can not be accepted that the applicant has worked for  
240 days. It has also been denied by the respondents that  
the applicant worked under the P.W.I., Churk

5. I am not inclined to consider regarding question  
whether the applicant worked or did not work in the  
service of the respondents. The facts that the applicant  
has chosen his claim for re-engagement as casual labour  
in the year 1999 is clearly barred by statutory provisions  
regarding limitation. The applicant has chosen to come  
after 21 years of last engagement and there is a catena  
judgements which bars such claim and grant of any  
relief. Hence, this claim is rejected on the ground of  
limitation.

6. There will be no order as to costs.

  
Member- A.

/Anand/