

⑦

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL JAIPUR BENCH
J A I P U R .

...

CA No. 654/1994

&

MA No. 200/95

Date of order: 19.1.1996

&

MA No. 443/95

Ganga Sahai Gurjar : Applicant

Versus

Union of India & others : Respondents

None present for the applicant, even the case was called 2nd
Mr. M. Rafiq, counsel for the respondents time.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI N.K. VERMA, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

HON'BLE SHRI RATTAN PRakash, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

O R D E R

(PER HON'BLE SHRI N.K. VERMA, MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE))

Heard Mr. M. Rafiq, learned counsel for the respondents who argued against the admission of this case stating that the date of birth as recorded in the service book is 12.11.1930 which was never under any dispute by the applicant. For the first time he made representation in 1974 and thereafter he made no further agitation in this regard.

We have the recent judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court given in the case of Union of India Vs. Kantilal Hemantram Panley cited at 1995(3)SLJ page 131 saying that the Tribunal allowed a change in date of birth even in the face of Supreme Court decision in Harman Singh's case. Altercation was claimed at the far end of the career. The Tribunal should not have entertained a stale claim. The Hon'ble Apex Court had made the observation that this is

8

-: 2 :-

patently objectionable and thereafter set-aside the decision of CAT Ahmedabad. In view of the strong view taken by the Apex Court, we do not find it a matter which merits any consideration at this stage. The application is therefore dismissed at the admission stage itself.

The Mas Nos. 200/95 and 443/95 also disposed of accordingly.



(PATIK PRAYASH)
MEMBER (J)



(N.K.VERMA)
MEMBER (A)