

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

---

**ORDERS OF THE BENCH**

---

Date of Order- 23-04-2015

OA No. 291/00149/2014 with MA No. 291/00131/2014

Dr. V. Varughese, counsel for applicant.

Mr. Mukesh Agarwal, counsel for respondents.

This Original Application is filed by the applicant praying for the following reliefs:

"(1) The impugned orders Annexure A/1, Annexure A/2, Annexure A/3, Annexure A/4, Annexure A/5 and Annexure A/6 may kindly be quashed and set aside and the respondents be directed that:

(i). The applicant be paid salary for the period 1.8.2007 to 6.5.2008 i.e. for 9 months and 6 days along with increment for the said period with cumulative effect.

(ii). The applicant be paid against the EL and HPL for the period from 1.8.2007 to 6.5.2008.

(iii). The period from 1.8.2007 to 6.5.2008 be taken into account for the promotion and ACP/MACP, if any due to the applicant, and

(iv) The period from 1.8.2007 to 6.5.2008 be treated as qualifying period for computation of his gratuity, pension and leave encashment etc.

(2). Cost of the Original Application be awarded in favour of the applicant.

(3). Any other appropriate relief which this Hon'ble Tribunal may feel proper and just in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be allowed in favour of the applicant."

2. The applicant ~~is~~ retired from service on 31.01.2013.

The grievance of the applicant is that the department has treated the period from 01.08.2007 to 06.05.2008 as 'dies

non'. The applicant claims salary for the period from 01.08.2007 to 06.05.2008 and also other consequential service benefits.

3. The applicant failed to ventilate his grievances, which relates to the year 2007-08 within a reasonable period. There is inordinate delay of more than 7 years in approaching the jurisdictional Court / Tribunal. The Annexure A/2 is dated 19.08.2010 and Annexure A/3 is dated 23.10.2010. The applicant submitted that he had made number of requests to the respondents not to treat the period from 01.08.2007 to 06.05.2008 as 'dies non'.

4. On examination of the material available on record, we find that the applicant had not shown sufficient reasons for condoning the delay in entertaining the Original Application. The Original Application is filed after inordinate delay of more than 7 years. We do not find any reason to entertain the application. We are not inclined to entertain this Original Application at this stage. The Original Application and the Misc. Application for condonation of delay are, therefore, dismissed.

  
(R. RAMANUJAM)  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

  
(JUSTICE HARUN-UL-RASHID)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER