

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

\*\*\*

Date of Decision: 20.3.2002

OA 358/2001 with MA 270/2001

Krishna Kumar Gaur s/o Late Shri Hukum Singh r/o 1184/26,  
Ghisa Patel ki Jamin, Bhagwan Ganj, Ajmer.

... Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through General Manager, W/Rly, Churchgate, Mumbai.
2. Chief Works Manager (E), Loco Workshop, W/Rly, Ajmer.
3. Sr. Personnel Officer (E), Loco Workshop, W/Rly, Ajmer.

... Respondents

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR.A.P.NAGRATH, ADM.MEMBER

For the Applicant ... Mr. C.B.Sharma

For the Respondents ... None

O R D E R

PER HON'BLE MR.A.P.NAGRATH, ADM.MEMBER

Applicant's father died in harness on 12.8.74. At the relevant time, the applicant was a minor. On becoming major, he made a request for his appointment on compassionate grounds in 1990. His request was rejected vide letter dated 18.12.91 (Ann.A/4). By filing this OA u/s 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has made a prayer that the respondents be directed to appoint him on compassionate grounds after quashing the letter dated 18.12.91 (Ann.A/4), letter dated 3.4.92 (Ann.A/5) and the letter dated 22.7.98 (Ann.A/7).


2. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant. It is not in dispute that the request of the applicant for his appointment on compassionate grounds was rejected in the year 1991 and this OA has been filed in the year 2001. The



learned counsel submits that vide letter dated 22.7.98 (Ann.A/7) applicant's request for appointment on compassionate grounds was rejected again. Aggrieved with this action, he has filed this OA.

3. I have perused the letter dated 22.7.98 (Ann.A/7). which is a communication addressed to the General Secretary of Western Railway Employees Union. This, in no way, can be stated to be any communication to the applicant, but even considering this date, this application has been filed rather belatedly. In fact the cause of action arose only when the applicant's request was rejected vide letter dated 18.12.91 (Ann.A/4) and he did not agitate the matter before this Tribunal in time. This application is hopelessly barred by time and the same is dismissed on this ground.

4. MA 270/2001, for condonation of delay, is also rejected.



(A.P.NAGRATH)  
ADM.MEMBER