

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Original Application No. 1360 of 2000

Allahabad this the 01st day of June, 2001

Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

MAKHAN LAL JAISWAL, S/o Late BABU LAL, Resident of
196, Nayapura, Stanely Road, Allahabad U.P.

Applicant

By Advocates Shri R. Chandra
Shri J.C. Joshi

Versus

1. The Principal Accountant General (Accounts and Entitlement)-I Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad.
2. The Controller and Auditor General of India, New Delhi-110002.
3. The Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Personnel, New Delhi.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri Amit Sthalekar

O_R_D_E_R (Oral)

By Hon'ble Mr.S.K.I. Naqvi, Member (J)

The applicant-Makhan Lal Jaiswal has come up seeking relief to the effect that the respondents be directed to include the name of the applicant in Live Casual Labour Register and to provide him work at his turn.

2 As per applicant's case he worked for 365 days

...pg.2/-

Scur

in between the period from 01.12.82 to 31.12.82 and thereafter he remained in waiting for his turn. When nothing heard from the side of the respondents and the other similarly ~~and the other similarly~~ situated casual labours were given service, he moved a representation on 28.09.98 repeated by another representation dated 09.11.98, which has been replied as per annexure-1 informing him that since his name was not there in the list of casual labours, therefore, his name could not be entered in the Live Casual Labour Register and now he has come up impugning annexure A-1, seeking relief as above.

3. The respondents have contested the case.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is not in dispute that the applicant worked only upto 31.12.1982 and never thereafter. He also kept silent even upto 1998 when he preferred the representations as referred above. The cause of action to the applicant could arise when he was not engaged thereafter 31.12.1982 or at the most when his name was not entered in the Live Casual Labour Register in pursuance of notification of 1987 and now after having long sleep of more than 16 years, he has come up seeking relief, which is grossly barred by period of limitation. The applicant has impugned the order dated 14.9.1999 and wishes that limitation be reckoned from that date, but this letter dated 14.9.1999 is in response to applicant's representation of 1998 when the matter had already

decomposed and, therefore, it will not be of any help to him.

6. For the above, the O.A. is dismissed being barred by period of limitation. No order as to costs.

See page
Member (J)

/M.M./