

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

* * *

Date of Decision: 12.01.2001

OA 430/99

Kailash Kumar Sharma s/o Shri Janki Lal Sharma r/o village Post Bhuma Chota Bhuba, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. Sikar.

... Applicant

v/s

1. Union of India through Secretary, Department of Posts, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Chief Post Master General, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Supdt. of Post Offices, Postal Deptt., Sikar Division, Sikar.

... Respondents

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S. RAIKOTE, VICE CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE MR. N.P. NAWANI, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

For the Applicant ... Mr. D.P. Pujari

For the Respondents ... ---

ORDER

PER HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S. RAIKOTE, VICE CHAIRMAN

This application is filed for a direction to the respondents to provide the applicant all the benefits of continuous service from July, 1986 to 1988 and also the balance of salary.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that the applicant worked as RTP Clerk between July, 1986 to 1988.

The persons worked during that period got some benefits and the applicant should have been given the same benefit.

M

But without considering his application, the department has rejected his representation vide order dated 31.3.99 (Ann.A/7) and, therefore, the same is illegal. Accordingly, the applicant is entitled to appropriate relief.

3. This application is a vague application without any particulars as to the nature of the duty the applicant has rendered between July, 1986 to 1988. In fact, when the applicant made representation, the department called for the details as to in what capacity he was working between the aforesaid period and whether he was continued and discontinued and what happened to his service, for which the applicant did not give any detail nor he furnished any document in support of the same. Consequently, the department rejected his application dated 31.3.91 stating that he was not entitled for any relief. It appears that vide Ann.A/1 the applicant was given some offer of appointment in the year 1988, which appears that the applicant has not accepted. The applicant also is not basing any claim on the basis of that offer of appointment. From the circumstances, it appears that applicant worked as RTP Clerk from July, 1986 to 1988 as a standby arrangement without any regular work as such. He has not stated what benefit should have been given to him which the others got. Assuming for the sake of argument that he was entitled to



certain benefits during July, 1986 to 1988, he could have approached the appropriate forum in the year 1988 or 1989. But this application is filed only in the year 1999, merely after 10 years. There is no application for condonation of delay also. From this fact it is clear that not only the application is vague, ~~but also~~ unintelligible but it is also hopelessly barred by time. In the circumstances, we have no option but to pass the order as under :-

The application is dismissed at the stage of admission.


(N.P. NAWANI)

MEMBER (A)


(B.S. RATKOTE)
VICE CHAIRMAN