

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**MUMBAI BENCH**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. : 319 of 1999.**

***Dated this Tuesday, the 20th day of February, 2001.***

**CORAM** : ***Hon'ble Shri Justice Ashok Agarwal, Chairman.***

***Hon'ble Shri B. N. Bahadur, Member (A).***

1. ***Smt. Surekha Ravindra Wadekar  
Widow of late Shri Ravindra  
Madhav Wadekar.***

2. ***Shri Anil Madhav Wadekar,  
Brother of Late Shri  
Ravindra Madhav Wadekar.***

***Residing at : Flat No. 10,  
Laxmi Krupa Housing Society,  
Jail Road, Bhim Nagar,  
Nasik Road.***

... ***Applicants.***

***(By Advocate Shri D. V. Ganga)***

**VERSUS**

1. ***The Union of India through  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Finance,  
New Delhi.***

2. ***The General Manager,  
India Security Press,  
Nasik Road,  
Nasik - 422 101.***

3. ***The General Secretary,  
India Security Press  
Mazdoor Sangh,  
India Security Press,  
Nasik Road - 422 101.***

... ***Respondents.***

***(By Advocate Shri V. S. Masurkar)***

**O R D E R (ORAL)**

***PER : Shri Ashok Agarwal, Chairman.***

***By the present O.A., Applicant No. 2 seeks compassionate  
appointment. He is the brother of the deceased employee who died***

... 2

*(Signature)*

in harness on 30.06.1987. He, in the circumstances, on 19.10.1987 applied for compassionate appointment. The aforesaid application however came to be rejected by an order passed on 27.01.1997. The present O.A. is filed on 09.03.1999.

2. Present O.A., we find, is hopelessly barred by limitation. In the Miscellaneous Application for condonation of delay, it is *inter-alia* contended that in respect of similar applications made by candidates similarly placed, orders of compassionate appointment were belatedly passed in their favour. A prayer is accordingly made for condonation of delay. In our view, the aforesaid grant can be no ground for making prayer for condonation of delay. There is no limitation laid down for the department to grant reliefs. However, the Administrative Tribunals Act provides for a period of limitation for filing applications for seeking reliefs under the Act. Merely because reliefs have been belatedly granted in certain other cases, this can be no justification for the Applicant not to approach the Tribunal within the time stipulated. It cannot be overlooked that the death of the relative of the Applicant No. 2 <sup>was</sup> has taken up way back on 30.06.1987 and we are already in the year 2001. No case for grant of compassionate appointment can be said to have been made out at this belated stage.

3. In the circumstances, the Miscellaneous Application for condonation of delay is rejected. Similarly, the present O.A. is also dismissed. No order as to costs.

B. N. Bahadur  
(B. N. BAHADUR)  
MEMBER (A).

  
(ASHOK AGARWAL)  
CHAIRMAN.