

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.**

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 474/2000
Dated the 10th December, 2001**

**CORAM: HON'BLE SHRI S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE SHRI S.L. JAIN, MEMBER (J)**

Shri Bai Kudtarkar,
Aged 80 years,
Occupation: Retired
Drama Producer (Staff Artist)
of All India Radio.
Residing at : 2 Lakshmi Narayan
Niwas, 25th Road, T.P.S. III,
Bandra (West), Mumbai 400 050. ... Applicant
(Applicant by Shri P.G. Bhimrao, Advocate)

vs.

1. The Director General,
Directorate General,
All India Radio,
Akashvani Bhavan,
New Delhi.
2. The Station Director,
All India Radio,
New Broadcasting House,
Backbay Reclamation,
Mumbai 400 020.
3. The Ministry of Information and
Broadcasting,
Govt. of India,
New Delhi.
4. The Administrative Officer,
All India Radio,
New Broadcasting House,
Backbay Reclamation,
Mumbai 400 020. Respondents.

(Respondents by Shri S.S. Karkera, Advocate)

O R D E R (oral)

[Per: S.R.Adige, Vice Chairman (A)]:

Applicant impugnes respondent's order dated 31.3.2000
(page 8 of the O.A.) rejecting his prayer for grant of monthly
pensionary benefits in response to Ministry of Information &
Broadcasting letter dated 29.11.1991 (Page 21 of the O.A.).

...2/-

2. Heard both sides.

3. It is not denied that the applicant retired on superannuation on 30.6.1979. Para 2 of the Circular dated 29.11.1991 states clearly that pensionary benefits would be admissible only to Staff Artists/Artists under the 1982 Scheme working in All India Radio and Doordarshan (except Foreign Nationals) who were in service on 6th March, 1982 or were appointed as such thereafter.

4. As applicant retired from service on 30.6.1979, manifestly he cannot seek the benefit of aforesaid Circular dated 29.11.1991.

5. That part applicant has filed this O.A. on 30.6.2000 nearly nine years after the issue of the aforesaid Circular dated 29.11.1991. Applicant contends that he had represented to respondents on 7.3.2000 and upon rejection of the representation by the impugned order dated 31.3.2000, had filed this O.A. Clearly, the prayer contained in the O.A. is grossly time barred and hit by limitation, and the reasons advanced by the applicant are not sufficient to condone the delay.

6. In the result, the O.A. is dismissed for the reasons mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs.

7. No costs.

S.L. Jain
(S.L. Jain)
Member (J)

S.R. Adige
(S.R. Adige)
Vice Chairman (A)

s.j*

dt 15/12/01
Order/Judgment despatched
to _____
on 31/12/01 _____
