IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIKUNAL

AHMEDABAD BENCH

O.A. No. 158 OF 1993 with M.A./188/93.

DATE OF DEC	ISION_17/06/1993.
1 7 1	, CA.,
The Post Master General, Ahmedaba	d.Petitioner
Shri Akil Kureshi	_Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
Versus	2 . 1
Shri B.C.Desai	Respondent
Party in Person	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B.Patel

: Vice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. V.Radhakrishnan

- : Member (A)
- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement?
- 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
- 3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement?
- 4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

No.

The Post Master General AHMEDABAD.

....Applicant.

(Advocate : Mr.Akil Kureshi)

Versus

Shri B.C.Desai, C/o.Head Record Office, R.M.S. AM Division, Ahmedabad - 2.

... Respondent.

(Party in Person)

ORAL JUDGMENT

O.A.NO. 158 OF 1993

WITH

M.A.No. 188 OF 1993.

Date: 17/06/1993.

Per : Hon'ble Mr. N.B.Patel : Vice Chairman

The Opponent who is the Original Applicant in Original Application: Ref: No.I.T.C. (15 of 1988) files reply to the M.A. Reply be taken on record.

we are not inclined to condone the delay which, according to the applicant himself, is of the order of more than 2 1½ years. It is pertinent to note that the application does not anywhere disclose as to when the applicant had got the copy of the award of the Tribunal. It is also stated in a general way that, after the papers were handed over to the Standing Counsel for drafting the memo of the "figinal Application, the applicant's representative

had "frequently" approached the standing counsel from July, 1991 to February, 1992 to see that the Original Application is filed before the Tribunal in time. Then there is a statement that despite these efforts on the part of the department to see that the Original Application is filed in time, the standing counsel could not file in time "for want of time". There is nothing to substantiate this averment of the standing counsel having failed kto file in time the application "for want of time". It is only a bare statement. It cannot be accepted readily. There is also no adequate explanation as to why the application was not filed promptly even after the standing counsel of the department was changed. Thus, we find that there is no merit in, M.A. and dismiss the same. As M.A. for condonation of delay is dismissed, the O.A./158/93 is summarily rejected as time-barred. No order

(V.Radhakrishnan) Member (A)

as to costs.

(N.B.Patel) Vice Chairman

AIT

AHMEDABAD BENCH

Application No. OPI 58 193 of 19

Transfer Application No. Old w.Pett.No

CERTIFICATE

Certified that no further action is required tobe taken and the case is fit for consignment to the Record Room (Decided).

Dated: 22/07/93.

Countersigned: R.S. Chnistian

Signature of the Dealing Assistant.

Section officer Court officer.

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AT AHMEDABAD BENCH

INDEX SHEET

	CAUSE TITIE OF 193.	OF 19	
NAMES O	F THE PARTIES DS. Drownd PMG Ahmedo	abed	
	VE RS US		
List I & OB			
PART A B & C			
SR. NO.	DESCRIOTION OF DOCUMENTS	PÂŒ	
	Application.	1 to 2 13	
STATE THE THE LAND SHELLENG THE	MALTER 193 Restarting Condonation	2010.39	
BUTTO CARLOS CAR	ed delay.	14-10-16	
		a i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
at control of the second of th	ang digita (sagar ang	CONTRACTOR CAR THE CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	
7.		edenggyrgus sprographysissanakki rakkiskki sikkesishidid	
material of the land of the la	The second secon	ng window gaganasaan militara sidge wadge wadge wadge didigensiden sid	
Continue of the Care State of the Care of			
······································	COMA DECEMBENT BY AN AND AND AN AND AN AND AN AND AN AND AND	make the country of t	
The second section of the second			
Marine or physical action of the supply and			
and opposite the standard for the standard with		er an entre of the first day of days above 19 3 March 19 10 March	
		and the second of the second s	
glimajerenija zagrazanjuzanju svep u			