

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

AHMEDABAD BENCH
NEW DELHIM.A./93/91
inO.A. No.203/90
~~XXXXXX~~

1991

DATE OF DECISION 9.4.1991

Shri Piyushbhai B.Parmar

Petitioner

Mrs.K.V.Sampat

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

Respondent

Mr.N.S.Shevde

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. M.M.Singh

: Administrative Member

The Hon'ble Mr. R.C.Bhatt

: Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? Yes
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? No
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? No
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? No

Shri Piyushbhai B.Parmar,
Railway retired servant of Godhra
(Advocate: Mrs. K.V.Sampat)

: Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India
through:
The General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate, Fort,
Bombay.
2. Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway, Pratapnagar,
Vadodara.
3. Divisional Mechanical Engineer(Loco)
Western Railway, Pratapnagar,
P.O.Vadodara.
4. Assistant Mechanical Engineer(LOCO)
W.Rly, Pratapnagar, Vadodara.
(Advocate: Mr.N.S.Shevde)

: Respondents

ORAL ORDER

M.A./93/91 in OA/203/90

Date: 9.4.1991

Per: Hon'ble Mr. M.M.Singh

: Administrative Member

1. Mrs.K.V.Sampat, learned counsel for the applicant not present. Heard Mr.N.S.Shevde, learned counsel for the respondents.
2. This application seeking condonation of delay opposed by the respondents.
3. The applicant has counted cause of action arising from 12.5.1989 which is a reply to a representation after the appeal application of the applicant was rejected by the respondents. The revision application was rejected by order dated 9.2.1988. The cause of action therefore arose on or about that time and the application should have been filed within one year from that. The repeated representations do not enhance the limitation. The applicant has made wrong averment in the application regarding cause of action arising from 12.5.1989. The application is therefore liable to be dismissed. We hereby dismiss the same rejected as a result the O.A./203/90 is also dismissed.


(R.C.Bhatt)
Judicial Member


(M.M.Singh)
Admv. Member

O.A./203/90

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. M.M. Singh .. Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. N.R. Chandran .. Judicial Member

19.7.1990

Heard counsel for the applicant and respondents. The respondent raises an objection that the application is barred by limitation in as much as the statutory order passed on the revision is dt. 9.2.1988 and therefore further representations made by the applicant cannot be taken into account of fixing the limitation. There is considerable force in this contention. At this stage, counsel for the applicant wants time to file an application for condonation of delay. Post the matter for admission, after the condonation of delay application is filed.

Mogera
(N R Chandran)
Judicial Member

H. M. S.
(M M Singh)
Administrative Member

*Mogera