

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,

LUCKNOW DIVISION,

LUCKNOW.

Case No. 83 of 1990.

Date of decision 22/3/94.

Sita Ram Singh ::::::: Applicant.

(None) ::::::: Vs.

1. Supt. of Post
Offices, Kanpur
Muzsil Divn.,
Kanpur.

2. Director of
Post Offices,
Kanpur.

2. Inspector of
Post Office,
Bighapur,
Dist. Unnao. ::::::: Respondents.

(By Dr. Dinesh
Chandra, Counsel)

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.C. SAKSENA, VICE-CHAIRMAN.

HON'BLE MR. K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE).

JUDGMENT.

(By Hon. Mr. Justice B.C. Saksena, V.C.)

The list has been revised. The case was called out twice. The learned counsel for the applicant has neither appeared nor sent any request for adjournment. The question involved in the C.A. is about the date of birth of the applicant. Counter affidavit has been filed in which it has been averred that in the descriptive particulars submitted by the applicant at the time of his appointment, in his own handwriting, he has shown his date of birth as 17-10-1922. The said descriptive particulars also been duly attested and counter-signed by the

(A)
A

other officers of the Post Office. According to the said date of birth, the applicant has been retired. No rejoinder-affidavit has been filed by the applicant to controvert the averments made in the said counter-affidavit, though a copy of the same was served on the learned counsel for the applicant as back as in September, 1990. Presumably the applicant has nothing to controvert the averments made in the counter-affidavit. The O.A. is accordingly dismissed for non-prosecution as also on merits.


MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)


VICE-CHAIRMAN.

Dated: 22/8/94, Lucknow.

(nair)