

①

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JABALPUR BENCH,
JA BALPUR

Original Application No.690 of 2006

Jabalpur this the 23rd day of October, 2006.

Hon'ble Dr.G.C.Srivastava,Vice Chairman

1. Aiysha Bee W/o late Shri Abdul Salam Aged about 64 years, R/o H.No.713, Behind Jama Masjid Mandi Madar Tekari, Jabalpur, M.P.

2. Mohammd Ateek S/o Late Shri Abdul Salam Aged about 33 years, R/o H.No.713, Behind Jama Masjid Mandi Madar Tekari, Jabalpur, M.P.

-Applicant

(By Advocate – Shri Rakesh Soni)

V E R S U S

1. Union of India Through its Secretary, Ministry of defense, Indian Ordinance Factories, New Delhi.

2. Chairman, Ordinance Factory Board, 10, Auckland Road, Kolkatta West Bengal.

3. General Manager, Ordinance Factory Khamariya, Jabalpur

-Respondents

(By Advocate – Shri S.K.Mishra)

O R D E R(Oral)

This Original Application has been filed against an order dated 22.8.2001 (annexure A-1) communicating ^{to} the applicant no.1 that her application for appointment of her fourth son on compassionate grounds has been rejected, as the family was not found in indigent condition. The applicant no.1 represented against

Q

the impugned order on 11.3.2005 followed by a reminder on 10.8.2005 (collectively marked as annexure A-5). The learned counsel for the applicants has not given any convincing reason for this inordinate delay in filing of this Original Application on 18.8.2006 whereas the impugned order is of 22.8.2001. Even the representation against the impugned order was filed almost four years after the order was issued. The applicant Smt. Aiysha Bee, who is joined by her son as applicant no.1, has five sons, all of whom ~~have~~ ^{had} attained majority at the time of the death of her husband. The compassionate appointment has been sought for the fourth son and not for the eldest. No reason for seeking appointment for the fourth son has been given. The fact that representation against the impugned order was submitted almost four years after the impugned order was received and this OA has been filed five years after the impugned order was issued, shows that the applicants are not very serious about their OA. A representation filed after such a long lapse of time cannot extend the limitation period. In view of this, I hold that the OA is barred by limitation and neither any application for condonation of delay nor any convincing reasons for delay in filing of this OA have been given. In view of this, the OA is dismissed at the admission stage itself.




(Dr. G.C. Srivastava)
Vice Chairman


rkv

पृष्ठांकन सं ओ/न्या.....जबलपुर, दि.....
पलिलिपि अर्पित :-

- (1) सचिव, उच्च न्यायालय वार एसोसिएशन, जबलपुर
- (2) आवेकक श्री/श्रीमती/मु.....के काउंसल
- (3) प्रत्यक्षी श्री/श्रीमती/मु.....के काउंसल
- (4) वॉयपाल, वॉयपाल, जयरा.....न्यायाधीन

सूचना एवं आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु
उप रजिस्ट्रार


Rakesh Saini
S.K. Mishra



26/6/06