

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, NAGPUR CAMP

3

O.A.868/92.

Smt. Agatha Alfred Robert

.. Applicant.

Vs.

Divisional Railway Manager, Nagpur

.. Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S. Deshpande, Vice Chairman.
Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A).

Appearances:

1. Mrs. Meenaxi Iyer, Counsel
for the applicant.
2. Mrs. Indira Bodade, Counsel
for the Respondents.

ORAL JUDGMENT :

Dated: 18.3.1993.

¶ Per : Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S. Deshpande, Vice Chairman ¶

Heard. The order removing the deceased Alfred Robert from service was passed on 1985 and the employee died in 1992. Two grounds have been given for the delay in filing the present O.A. one was that he ^{could} ~~cannot~~ present the application on account of poverty and the second one was that he approached one of ^{the} leading Lawyers of Nagpur to file his case before the Court but that advocate had not taken any action for more than two years and handed over papers to the applicant. It is apparent that the poverty cannot be the ground for the ^{from} ~~delay~~ in filing the application, and the learned advocate for the applicant ^{was} ~~did~~ not willing to disclose the name of that leading lawyer. In any event the delay of nearly 7 years for presenting the present application cannot be condoned. In the circumstances mentioned above the O.A.868/92 is disposed of as barred by time. Both the M.P.s also disposed of.

(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER(A).

(M.S. DESHPANDE)
V.C.

H.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, BOMBAY

R.P.NO. 37/93

in

OA.No. 868/92

Smt. Agatha Alfred Robert

.... Applicant

V/S.

Divisional Railway Manager, Nagpur... Respondent


CORAM: Hon'ble Vice Chairman Shri Justice M.S. Deshpande
Hon'ble Member (A) Shri M.Y. Priolkar

Tribunal's Order by Circulation

Dated: 26.11.1993

(PER: M.S. Deshpande, Vice Chairman)

^{while}
~~By the disposal~~ of OA.No. 868/92 we have held that
the delay of 7 years was not explained. No error apparent
on the face of the record has been pointed out and review
application cannot be the remedy for seeking relief only
because the applicant states that the decision is wrong.
The review application is dismissed.


(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A)


(M.S. DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN

mrj.