

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ERNAKULAM BENCH

DATED WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE
ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY NINE

PRESENT

HON'BLE SHRI G.SREEDHARAN NAIR, JUDICIAL MEMBER

&

HON'BLE SHRI N.V.KRISHNAN, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.271/89

P.Anantharam

-

Applicant

Vs

1. Union of India represented by
the Secretary, Ministry of
Defence, New Delhi.

2. Engineer-in-Chief,
M.E.S.Kashmir House,
Army Head Quarters DHQ .PO
New Delhi-110 011.

-

Respondents

Mr R.Krishnan Nair

-

Counsel of the applicant

O_R_D_E_R

(SHRI G.SREEDHARAN NAIR, JUDICIAL MEMBER)

Heard the ~~learned~~ counsel of the applicant.

2. The two reliefs claimed in this application by the applicant who retired as Chief Engineer, M.E.S., Cochin Zone are to direct the respondents to extend the service of the applicant by 4 years, and for a declaration that the denial of promotions to the cadre of Superintending Engineer and Additional Chief Engineer was illegal and that he is entitled the monetary benefits to the tune of more than Rs.5 lakhs.

3. The applicant has admittedly retired on superannuation on 30.4.1989. This application ^{has been} filed three days before that, on 27.4.1989.

..2...

K R

3. Counsel of the applicant submitted that he is not pressing the first relief for extension of the service of the applicant. As regards the second relief, it was submitted by him that a question of general importance concerning engineers is involved. We are afraid it is not ^a relevant consideration ~~filed~~ ^{while} dealing with the admission of the present application relating to an individual civil servant, who has filed an application feeling himself aggrieved by the denial of promotion to him.

4. According to the applicant he was promoted ~~to the~~ ^{as} Superintending Engineer only in 1974, as Additional Chief Engineer in 1984 and as Chief Engineer thereafter. His case is that he should have been promoted as Superintending Engineer in the year 1969, as Additional Chief Engineer in 1976 and as Chief Engineer in the year 1979. It is urged that such promotions were denied contrary to the recruitment rules. Even according to counsel of the applicant, the applicant had not made any representation against the alleged denial of promotion except through the one stated to have made on 17.3.1989, copy of which has been produced along with the application.

5. We have no hesitation to hold that it is not open to the applicant to complain against the denial of promotion

2 which took place during ^{the} 70's, and *the* application is hopelessly barred by limitation.

6. The application is rejected.


(N.V. KRISHNAN)
ADME. MEMBER


(G. SREEDHARAN NAIR)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

28-6-1989

trs