

(15)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, BOMBAY
* * * * *

R.A.No.188/92 in
O.A.No.636/90.

DATE OF DECISION : 10/12/92

Narendrakumar

- Applicant

Mr.L.M.Nerlekar

- Counsel for the applicant

V/S

Commander Works Engineer,
24, Assaye Building,
Colaba, Bombay 400 005.

- Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Member (A), Shri M.Y.Priolkar
Hon'ble Member (J), Shri N.Dharmadan

JUDGMENT

MR. N.DHARMADAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER

This review application and M.P.No.937/92 for condonation of delay are filed by the original applicant. On a perusal of the RA and the accompanying M.P. we are of the opinion that they can be disposed of by circulation. Accordingly, we dispose of the same by circulation on the basis of following orders.

2. The applicant challenged his transfer order No.233 dated 24.10.89 in the original application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The main points raised at the time of arguments were considered and the application was rejected as per judgment dated 21.10.91. The applicant received a copy of the judgment on 31.10.91. He ought to have filed the RA within 30 days of receipt of a copy of the judgment, but actually the RA was filed on 21.10.92.

. . . .2/-

There is a long delay of about one year. The applicant has stated that he was laid up on account of some physical and mental strain and he was suffering from acute bronchities and jaundice. But he has not mentioned the details of the dates on which he was actually laid up and/^{recovered} from the ailments alleged by him in the M.P. No satisfactory explanation has been given as to what actually prevented him from taking steps for filing the RA by entrusting the matter to some other person who is related to him or very close to him in order to avoid the delay. The settled principle is that every day of delay in filing the RA should be explained with satisfactory and convincing reasons. The applicant has given only general statement without specific particulars and details and relevant dates for appreciating the contentions and the bonafides of the applicant in presenting the matter. Having regard to the facts and circumstances we are of the view that the reasons given in the application for condonation of delay are not satisfactory. We are not inclined to condone the delay and entertain the RA. Hence, we dismiss the application for condonation of delay without issuing notice to the opposite party. Consequently, we dismiss the application for review also. There will be no order as to costs.



(N.DHARMADAN)
JUDICIAL MEMBER



(M.Y.PRIOLKAR)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER