

CV

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,**  
**JABALPUR BENCH,**  
**JA BALPUR**

**Original Application No.690 of 2006**

**Jabalpur this the 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 Ordnance Factories, New Delhi.
2. Chairman, Ordnance Factory Board, 10, Auckland Road, Kolkatta West Bengal.
3. General Manager, Ordnance 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 <sup>to</sup> 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

C

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.

*G. C. Srivastava*  
**(Dr. G. C. Srivastava)**  
**Vice Chairman**

rky

पृष्ठांकन सं ओ/न्या	जबलपुर, दि.
पटिलिपि अन्ते शितः—	
(1) संविद, उच्च विधायकारां वार एसोसिएशन, जबलपुर	को वारांसल
(2) आंकेक श्री विजयी/मु	को काउंसल
(3) प्रत्यक्षी क्षी, विगती/मु	
(4) विधायकाल, लोद्जल, जगत, न्यायाली, सूचना एवं आदरश्यक कानूनी	

Rakesh Sanyal  
S.K. Majumdar