

M.A.No. 358 1989 with O.A. No. 10 1989

DATE OF DECISION 18-07-1989

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

Shri Ayub Mohmed Usmanbhai Belim, Petitioner

Shri B.B.Gogia

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of Andia and Anr.

Respondent

DRAM :

Hon'ble Mr.

P.H. Trivedi

Shri B.R.Kyada

: Vice Chairman

7 Hon'ble Mr.

P.M. Joshi

: Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?



2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?

0/0

3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? W

4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

MGIPRRND—12 CAT/86—3-12-86—15,000

Ayub Mohmed Usmanbhai Belim, Near Sita Darwaja, Kashba Masjid, Dhrangadhra. (Advocate-Mr. B.B. Gogia)

.. Applicant

Versus

- Union of ^India, through General Manager, W.Rly., Churchgate, Bombay.
- 2. Divisional Rly. Manager,
 W.Rly., Kothi Compound,
 Rajkot.

(Advocate-Mr. B.R. Kyada)

. Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. P.H. Trivedi .. Vice Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. P.M. Joshi .. Judicial Member

ORAL - ORDER

18.07.1989

Per : Hon'ble Mr. P.M. Joshi .. Judicial Member

The petitioner Shri Ayub Mohmed Usmanbhai (29)
Belim of Dhrangadhra has filed this application
under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals
Act, 1985. He has challenged the validity of the
order dated 24/25-3-1988 (Annexure A-9) whereby
his request for employment on compassionate ground
has been rejected. According to the petitioner, he
was entitled for consideration for employment on
compassionate grounds under the relevant rules.

2. When the matter came up for admission, we have heard Mr. B.B. Gogia, the learned counsel for the petitioner at a considerable length. While relying on the instructions contained in Annexures A-12 and A-13 dated 22.6.1978 and 29.8.1981 respectively, it was vehemently contended by Mr. Gogia that in the case of/ward, who becomes major, 5 years has been considered as eligible time allowed for

×

5

consideration and the railway authority has opened the cases of such persons even by passing such instruction. It was therefore, urged by Mr. Gogia that the case of the petitioner deserves consideration and the application be admitted, and the delay, if any in filing the application be condoned.

- 3. At the outset, it may be stated that Smt.

 Banu Ismail of deceased employee Usman Umar

 (died on 7.10.1967) did apply for such employment

 in the year 1967 and her request was rejected by

 the orders dated 5.2.1977 (Annexure A-1). The said

 order was not challenged by the widow of the deceased

 She applied on behalf of

 Usman Umar. However, again the present petitioner
- for such employment vide her application dated 30.8.1979. It is conceded that her request also was considered but rejected on 17.11.1979 (Annexure A-3).
- was informed under the said order dated 17.11.1979
 that his request has been rejected and no further
 correspondence will be entertained in this connection.
 It seems that the petitioner again applied on
 7.12.1979 and the same was similarly rejected vide
 letter dated 18.12.1979. It is nearly after a decade
 the present petitioner again seems to have made
 representation with the result, the impugned order
 was passed. As a matter of fact, the grievance of
 the petitioner arose long back in the year 1979
 when his fix request for employment on compassionate
 ground was rejected. It is significant to note that

repeated requests would not keep the cause alive.

Thus obviously, the cause is clearly barred by
limitation and the application cannot be entertained.

Even otherwise on merit, there is hardly any point
which requires consideration. The application,
therefore, rejected at the stage of admission under
section 19(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act,

1985. M.A./358/89, also stands disposed of.

(P H Trivedi) Vice Chairman

(PM Joshi)
Judicial Member

*Mogera