

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ERNAKULAM BENCH

DATED FRIDAY THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE  
ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY NINE

PRESENT

HON'BLE SHRI P. K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

&

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

O.A. 345/89

R. Sasidharan

Applicant

Vs.

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

and

2. Asst. Director, NSSO (FOD)  
Kerala Region, Ambulavilasom Road,  
Turnview TC 28/395, Vanchiyoor,  
Trivandrum-35

Respondents

M/s. Vellayani M.A. Sundararaju and  
Vellayani M. A. Robinson

Counsel for  
the applicant

ORDER

Shri P. K. Kartha, Vice Chairman

We have heard learned counsel for the applicant.

on the question of admission. The relief~~s~~ sought in the application is against the impugned order of reversion dated 2.3.1984, Annexure-A (page 10 of the Paper Book). The learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant had made several representations against the impugned order but no reply has been received by him.

He drew our attention to a representation made by the applicant on 1.5.1989 wherein he had requested for promotion to the post of Upper Division Clerk. This was turned down by the respondents vide their letter dated 11.5.1989 at Annexure-B (page 11 of the Paper Book). The reply of the respondents dated 11.5.1989 cannot be taken as the starting point of limitation as it was not in reply to the first representation made by the applicant seeking relief against the reversion.

2. The applicant has filed M.P. 371/89 for condoning the delay in filing the present application. We have gone through the same and, in our opinion, there are no good grounds for condoning the delay.

3. The learned counsel drew our attention to the fact that the applicant belongs to Scheduled Castes community and that in view of his financial constraints, he could not approach the Court of Law for redressal of the grievances within the limitation period. We do not think that this reason would justify condonation of delay of four years and four months, as prayed for in the M.P.

4. In the circumstances, we are of the opinion that the present application is not maintainable on the ground that it is barred by limitation. The application is

dismissed at the admission stage itself on the ground  
that it is barred by limitation.

  
16.6.89  
(N. V. Krishnan)  
Administrative Member

16.6.89

  
16/6/89  
(P. K. Kartha)  
Vice Chairman (J)  
16.6.1989

knn