

Fixed for A.H. during the
w/c from 6.3.95 at Naghm.
along with MP. (N) 1/95 for
Condonation of delay.

6/3/95
Sl. No. 39

Resalah
2/1/95

None for the parties.

Notice before admission
returnable in the
week commencing from
17.4.95.

Issued notices

to respondents M.R. Kolhatkar ✓
(M.R. Kolhatkar) (M.S. Deshpande)
an 14/3/95 M/P) ✓
J.

CSE
14/3/95

Dated: 17.4.95 (Sl No 10)

Applicant has sent an
application for adjournment.
as his counsel is not well.
list the case in the week
commencing from 10.7.95

(P.P. Srivastava) ✓
M(A)
(M.S. Deshpande)
VC

Dated: 10.7.95

None for the applicant. Mrs. Indira
Bodade for the respondents.

The applicant has filed an application
for condonation of delay. We have gone through
the application and we find no justifiable
reason for condoning the delay in respect
of the cause of action in 1989. The appli-
cation for condonation of delay is dismissed.
The OA is dismissed as barred by time.

Order / Judgement despatched
to Applicant/Respondent (s)
on 18/7 & 21/8/95 healy

21/8/95 M/P) (P.P. Srivastava)
M(A)

(M.S. Deshpande)
VC

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH, 'GULESTAN' BUILDING NO.6
PRESCOT ROAD, BOMBAY-1
CIRCUIT SITTING AT NAGPUR

REVIEW PETITION NO. (N) 17/95

in

O.A. No. 111/95

P.S. Pahurkar

..Applicant

V/s.

Union of India & 2 ors.

..Respondents


Coram: Hon. Shri Justice M.S. Deshpande, V.C.
Hon. Shri P.P. Srivastava, Member (A)


TRIBUNALS ORDER: (By Circulation)
(Per: P.P. Srivastava, Member (A))

DATED: 25-9-95

The applicant in the Review Petition has brought out that neither he nor his Advocate could attend the Court on the date of hearing and that the applicant has a good case on merit and he has raised substantial question of law and facts in the O.A. The applicant's reasons for condonation of delay was considered by us and we had come to the conclusion that there is no justifiable reason for condoning the delay in respect of cause of action in 1989.

2. No material has been brought out in the Review Petition which would warrant reconsidering of the decision which has already been taken for dismissing the application for condonation of delay. We therefore do not think that the order dated 10.7.95 needs any review and the Review Petition is dismissed.


(P.P. Srivastava)
Member (A)


(M.S. Deshpande)
Vice Chairman