

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH**

**O.A.No.431/2006.**

Friday this the 15 th day of December 2006.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE Dr. K.B.S.RAJAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**  
**HON'BLE MR. N.RAMAKRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

V.G.Krishnan Achary, S/o Gopal  
residing at Vengolakkunnel House,  
Anikkad, Kottayam District.  
(Former EDDA and Packer,  
Anikkad Post Office).                      Applicant

(By Advocate Shri N.K.Somasekharan Pillai)

**Vs.**

1.     Postal Inspector,  
        Kangara Palli,  
        Kottayam District.
2.     Superintendent of Post Offices,  
        Changaacherry P.O., Kottayam Dist.
3.     Post Master General,  
        Kochi Region, Kochi.
4.     Chief Post Master General,  
        Trivandrum, P.M.G.Junction,  
        Near Palayam.
5.     Director General,  
        Postal Department,  
        New Delhi.                      Respondents

(By Advocate Shri TPM Ibrahim Khan, SCGSC)

The application having been heard on 15.12.2006  
the Tribunal on the same day delivered the following

**ORDER**

**HON'BLE Dr. K.B.S.RAJAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

The applicant has challenged the order dated 23.2.2000(A1) whereby his  
claim for certain allowances as Mail Carrier was turned down with a specific

remark "We are treating the case as closed". Against this order of 2000, the applicant has filed this O.A.431/06 with an application for condonation of delay of 2256 days. We are not convinced of the grounds for delay. Counsel for the applicant submitted that he had made certain representations to the Superintendent which have not been responded to so far. We are agreeable that the limitation period cannot be extended on account of such representations not having been disposed of. The Apex Court in the case of Shri S.S. Rathore Vs.State of Madhya Pradesh (1989) 4 SCC 582, has clearly stated that the repeated unsuccessful representations cannot be enlarged the limitation period. In this case as the department has clearly stated that they had treated the case as closed, the applicant ought to have come before this Tribunal within the period of limitation as provided under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

2. On account of inordinate delay, the O.A. is dismissed. No costs.

Dated the 15 th December, 2006



**N.RAMAKRISHNAN**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**



**Dr.K.B.S.RAJAN**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**