

५४ (प्रक्रिया) विधायक सभी के विषय में के सर्वांगीन निः शुल्क प्रवि

५४

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
JODHPUR BENCH, RAJ. HIGH COURT CAMPUS
JODHPUR.

COPY OF ORDER DATED 06.02.2008 PASSED IN MA NO.66/2007 IN
O.A.NO.82/2007.

APPLICANT RESPONDENTS
HANUMAN DAS VAISHNAV & ORS. VS. U.O.I. & OTHERS.

Date of Order : 6.2.2008
MA No. 66/2007 in OA No. 82/2007

Mr. A.K. Khatri, Advocate, counsel for applicants.
Mr. Manoj Bhandari, Advocate, counsel for respondents No.
1 to 3.

Mr. Salil Trivedi, Advocate, counsel for respondents No. 4.
Mr. J.K. Mishra, Advocate holding brief of
Mr. B. Khan, Advocate, counsel for respondent No. 5 and 7
to 13.

None present for respondents No. 6 and 14.

Heard learned counsel for the parties on M.A.
No. 66/2007 on condonation of delay and perused averments
made therein.

Ground for seeking condonation is as per the
pleadings contained in para 2 of the M.A. wherein, it is
stated that the applicants acquired knowledge of the
contents of letter dated 7.7.2003 only when they received
letter on 16.4.2007.

Facts stated in para 2 of M.A. have been denied
vide paras 1 of the reply/counter dated 17th January, 2008
(filed by opposite parties in MA) to show that applicant had
knowledge of the contents of letter dated 7.7.2003 and he
was in possession of relevant material for seeking redressal
of his grievance, if any. In para 2 of counter a reference is
also made to the consequential Seniority List dated 11th
May, 2005 and Order dated 28th July, 2005. The above
averments have to be read along with the pleadings
contained in para 4.18, 4.19 and 4.21 as well as Annex.
A/21 and Annex. A/23 to the O.A. Annexures referred in
the said paragraphs which will show that the applicants had
taken steps for redressal of their grievance (now raised in
this O.A.) by filing representations as early as in the year
2005.

In this view of the matter, explanation given in M.A.
for condoning delay in filing O.A. cannot be accepted and
his M.A. praying for condoning the delay, deserves to be
rejected.

The learned counsel for the applicants.

PTO



COMPARED &
CHECKED

38

— 2 —

however, submitted that, though, there is no specific pleading in the O.A. itself that representations made in the year 2005 were decided or no order deciding these representations has been communicated to the applicants but, he has instructions to state that said representation/s are still pending.

Shri Manoj Bhandari, Advocate (along with Shri Salil Trivedi and Shri B. Khan, Advocates), appearing on behalf of the Opposite Parties, however, stated that as per record/instructions available today with him, aforesaid representation(s) filed in the year 2005, were decided vide order dated 7th December, 2005 but, he is unable in absence of specific instructions, whether, said order dated 7.12.2005, was communicated to the applicant and, if so, when.

Be that as it may, if the representation(s) filed by the applicants in the year 2005 still pending, there is no reason as to why the same should not be decided and if said representation(s) have been decided vide order dated 7.12.2005 then said 'order' ought to have been communicated to the applicant. It goes without saying, that if the representation(s) have not been decided, the same may now be decided preferably within three months of receipt of a certified copy of this order and decision be communicated

forthwith to the applicants. If representation(s) have already been decided vide order dated 7.12.2005 (as per statement of Sh. Manoj Bhandari, Advocate, as noted above in this order) then, it must be communicated to the applicants for taking such steps as may be advised. Further, it is clarified that in case, order dated 7.12.2005 (referred to above) exists and also communicated in the past, then the respondents are not expected to undertake the 'exercise' again.

In view of the above discussions, this M.A. praying for condonation for delay is rejected.

No order as to costs.

S.M.

— 2 —

SD

[R.K. BHANDARI]
MEMBER[A]

[A.K.YOG.]
MEMBER[J]

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

Dated 14.02.08

मनुष्यान् विधिकारी (न्याय.)

Section Officer (Judl.)

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकार

Central Administrative Tribunal

जोधपुर न्यायालय, जोधपुर

Jodhpur Bench, Jodhpur.

JRM