

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BOMBAY BENCH.

Original Application No. 471/94.

Shri B.B.Ghule.

... Applicant.

V/s.

Union of India.

.... Respondent.

Coram: Hon'ble Shri Justice M.S.Deshpande, Vice-Chairman,  
Hon'ble Shri M.R.Kolhatkar, Member(A).

Appearances:-

Applicant by Shri P.V.Dawre.

Oral Judgment:-

¶ Per Shri M.S.Deshpande, Vice-Chairman] Dt. 4.4.1994.

We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant. He states that the limitation is saved because he had made a representation in the year 1987 against the impugned order and that was not replied to. If that was the position the application should have been made within one and half years after the making of the representation. That was not done. The applicant has filed an application for condonation of delay through (M.P. 415/94) in which he has stated that he could not make an application because he had to maintain a family of five members and he was poor. That is not the ground for condoning the delay over six years in filing the present application.

2. The application for condonation of delay is dismissed and the Original Application is also dismissed as barred by limitation.

*M.R.Kolhatkar*

(M.R.KOLHATKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

*M.S.Deshpande*

(M.S.DESHPANDE)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN.

B.