

(6) 11

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH: CUTTACK.

Original Application No.103 of 1989

Date of decision: 29th January, 1990.

1. Hrushikesh Das, S/o Late M.M. Das,
Retd. Head clerk, Office of the
Postmaster-General, Orissa Circle,
Bhubaneswar, Now at his permanent resident
at North to Raghunathjew Temple, Telengabazar,
Cuttack-9 (Orissa)

..... APPLICANT

-Versus-

1. The Secretary to the Government of India
Ministry of Communications, Department of
Posts, Director-General of Postal Services,
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Postmaster-General, Orissa Circle,
Bhubaneswar, District-Puri.

... RESPONDENTS

For the Applicant.	Mr. A.K. Nanda, Advocate
For the Respondents	Mr. Aswani Kumar Misra, Senior Standing Counsel (Central)

C O R A M :

THE HON'BLE MR. N. SENGUPTA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
A N D
THE HON'BLE MISS. USHA SAVARA, MEMBER (ADMN)

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed
to see the judgement ? Yes.
2. To referred to the Reporters or not ? No
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair
copy of the Judgement ? Yes.

.....

: - J U D G E M E N T : -

N. SENGUPTA, MEMBER (J)

In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act the relief that the applicant has sought for is to direct the Respondents to give him 3 more increments in the scale of pay in which he ^{and} was to give other consequential pensionary benefits.

2. For what we are going to state below it is un-necessary to set out all the facts alleged in the application. Suffice it to say that the applicant admittedly retired on superannuation on 31.3.1980. The applicant in the application has averred that he made successive representations with effect from May, 1980 till up to 1988. Representations prior to 1988 have been denied by the Respondents but it is un-necessary on our part to go into that question. On his own showing the applicant's cause of action, if any, could not have arisen after the date of his superannuation in March, 1980. Even assuming that all the representations mentioned in para-4(c) were made, they did not arrest the running time. It has been held by the Supreme Court that making of successive representations does not avail the applicant of anything with regard to the question of limitation. This Tribunal came into force in November, 1985 and the present application is clearly barred by limitation and no relief can be granted to the applicant. We therefore, do not accept the contention of the learned Counsel for the applicant and reject the application as barred by limitation.

No costs.



[Signature]
MEMBER (ADMN)

[Signature]
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

29.1.90