

(4)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 218/92

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 22.1.93

Shri Sudhir Shende Petitioner

Miss Sulekha Khumbhare Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

The D.G.P.N.T. New Delhi and ors. Respondent


Shri A.B. Chaudhary Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member (A)

The Hon'ble Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?


(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A)

NS/

(5)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH
Camp at Nagpur

Original application No. 218/92

Shri Sudhir Shende

... Applicant.

V/s.

The D.G. P.N.T.
New Delhi

The Post Master General
Maharashtra Circle
Bombay.

The Senior Superintendent
of Post Offices, M.F.L.
Division, Nagpur.

... Respondents.

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

Hon'ble Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member(J)

Appearance:

Miss Sulekha Khumbhare, counsel
for the applicant.

Shri A.B. Chaudhary, counsel
for the respondents.

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Dated: 22.1.93

¶ Per Shri M.Y.Priolkar, Member (A) ¶

The grievance of the applicant is about the rejection of his application for compassionate appointment by the respondents. Admittedly by letter dated 10.1.91 (Annex. A), the applicant's mother has been informed that her case for employment of her son on compassionate grounds in relaxation of normal Recruitment Rules had already been rejected by Director General, P & T, New Delhi and this decision had been communicated under letter dated 20.8.87. The learned counsel for the respondents strongly opposed the application saying that this application has been filed on 19.11.91 i.e. more than four years after the rejection by the competent authority had been communicated to the applicant. We find substance in this contention. The copy of the letter dated 20.8.87 addressed to the applicant, by which the

6

rejection of compassionate appointment was communicated is also annexed at page 14 of the paper book. No explanation for this ^{long} ~~being~~ delay in approaching the Tribunal is forthcoming. The only reason given is that the applicant had made a number of representations for reconsideration. But it is well settled that repeated representations will not have the effect of extending the limitation period. The application is accordingly rejected as time barred under the limitation provisions in the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

There shall be no order as to costs.



(V.D. DESHMUKH)
MEMBER (J)



(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)
MEMBER (A)

NS/