

01./ 13.9.2004. Let it be listed before the appropriate Bench for hearing as and when the same is available on 15.9.04.

/CBS/

(S. DOGRA) M(J)

(L.M. GOYAL) V.C.

2/17.9.04 Shri P.K.Verma, counsel for applicant  
None for respondents

List it for hearing on 9.11.04.

sks

(M. Jha) /M(A)

(S. Dogra) /M(J)

3/9.11.2004

None for the parties. Let it be listed before the appropriate bench as and when the same is available.

MPS.

(M. Jha) /M(A)

(A.K. Bhatnagar) /M(J)

RA No. 09 of 2004  
(Arising out of OA 47 of 1996)

4./ 14.2.2005.

O R D E R

None for the applicant.

Shri S.K. Tiwary, counsel for respondents.

After perusal of order sheet, it is seen that none was present on behalf of the parties on the previous date, i.e. 9.11.2004, which goes to show that the applicant has no interest in pursuing the matter.

2. So far as merits of the case is concerned, it is pointed out by the counsel for the respondents that it is barred by limitation. The order dismissing the main OA 47 of 1996 was passed on 11.11.2003 whereas RA was filed on 27.2.2004 which is beyond the limitation period of 30 days prescribed in the Rule, as per <sup>Rule 17 of C.A. (Procedure)</sup> ~~which no~~ Rules no application shall be entertained unless it is filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of copy of the order sought to be reviewed'. <sup>Even no provisions have been provided therein for condonation of delay.</sup>

3. Therefore, this RA stands dismissed and disposed of as barred by limitation. No order as to costs.

/CBS/

(M. J.A) M(A)

(S. DODRA) M(J)