

(3)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

Original Application No: 1327/93

Transfer Application No:

DATE OF DECISION 5-4-94

Kashimkhan Daudkhan Banda Nawaji Petitioner

Shri M.M.A. Momin Advocate for the Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and Ors. Respondent

Shri S.S. Karkera Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Shri N.K.Verma, Member(A)

The Hon'ble Shri

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 ?
- / NO

*N.K. Verma*  
(N.K.Verma)  
Member(A)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH

4

O.A.1327/93

Kashimkhan Daudkhan  
Banda Nawaji,  
Aurangabad-431001.

..

Applicant

vs

Union of India & Ors.

..

Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Shri N.K.Verma, Member(A)

Appearance:

Shri M.M.A.Momin  
counsel for the  
applicant.

Shri S.S.Karkera  
counsel for the  
respondents.

Dated: 5-4-94

Oral Judgement

(Per: Hon'ble Shri N.K.Verma, Member(A))

This is a case in which the learned counsel for the applicant passionately champigned a case of compassionate appointment of a son of a retired official of the P&T department who took voluntary retirement in 1965. He made his first application for appointment of his son in 1986. The application was duly rejected by the competent authority. Thereafter he took up the matter with Minister of Telecommunication, Govt. of India, New Delhi in response to which the applicant was asked to submit certain documents in 1987. He was asked thereafter to indicate if he was prepared for an appointment in Circle/Region other than Aurangabad. There is no evidence brought on record that the applicant persued the matter with the Department of Telecommunications with promptitude. It was some time in 1990 that he took up the matter with the concerned authorities

5

who replied to him that his case for the appointment on compassionate ground could not be agreed vide letter dated 21-8-91. Thereafter, the applicant has now come to the Tribunal on 31-3-93 for having matter adjudicated. Shri Karkera on behalf of respondents vehemently opposes the admission of this case as it is hopelessly time barred. After hearing both the sides I am convinced that this matter is time barred. The case is dismissed with no order as to costs.



(N.K.Verma)  
Member(A)

k