

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH

CIRCUIT COURT SITTING AT BILASPUR

Original Application No. 700 of 2005

Bilaspur, this the 7th day of March, 2006

Hon'ble Shri Justice B. Panigrahi, Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri Shankar Prasad, Administrative Member

S.N. Patro, S/o. late Shri S.V. Ratnam,  
aged about 69 years, R/o. Maharani Ward,  
Jagdalpur, District : Bastar (CG). ... Applicant

(By Advocate - Shri Prafull N. Bharat)

V e r s u s

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Loknayak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Joint Secretary (FRR), Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.
3. The Asstt. Settlement Commissioner, Rehabilitation Division, (Settlement Ministry of Home Affairs), Jaisalmer House, Mansingh Road, New Delhi. ... Respondents

O R D E R (Oral)

By Justice B. Panigrahi, Chairman -

The applicant was serving as a Senior Accountant in Dandkarniya Project and was placed in the pay scale of Rs. 210-380/-. It was revised to Rs. 425-640/- with effect from 1.1.1973. Accordingly, the pay of the applicant was fixed at Rs. 580/- as on 1.1.1973. The next date of increment was 15.2.1973 which was raised to Rs. 600/-. He reached the maximum of Rs. 640/- on 15.2.1975. He took voluntary retirement from service on 31st August, 1980. At the time of his retirement he was in the scale of Rs. 425-640/-. Pursuant to the orders of the Cuttack Bench of the Tribunal in OA No. 164/1990 & OA No. 165/1990 the pay scale of Rs. 425-640/- was revised to Rs. 550-900/- w.e.f. 1.1.1973. His pay thus became Rs. 780/- on 1.8.1980. The applicant submitted a representation sometime in 1993 and followed it

up with reminders the last one being in July, 2004. It is stated that there was some error.

2. It is a settled position of law that repeated & extend representations do not represent the period of limitation. The OA has been moved 12½ years after 1993 orders and after a lapse of about 23 years of his retirement. It is unreasonable to entertain such representations after expiry of such long period of limitation. It is settled position that even if some error has been committed by the respondents, no judicial directions can be issued after such long lapse of time. Since the pay of the applicant has been revised on the basis of the judgment of the other Bench of the Tribunal the applicant could have no other grievance. Accordingly, there is no merit in this case and the OA is dismissed. No costs.

*Shankar Prasad*  
(Shankar Prasad)  
Administrative Member

*B. Panigrahi*  
(B. Panigrahi)  
Chairman

"SA"

पृष्ठांकन सं. ओ/व्या.....जबलपुर, दि.....  
प्राप्ति/दिनांक.....  
(1) समिति राज्य विवरण वार एवं विवरण, जबलपुर  
(2) राज्यवाचक विवरण वार एवं विवरण, काउंसल  
(3) प्राप्ति/दिनांक विवरण वार एवं विवरण, काउंसल  
(4) राज्यवाचक, विवरण, जबलपुर, विवरण  
सूचना एवं आवश्यक, काउंसल हहु

*Pradip K. Bharat*  
*Adv B/19384*

उप रजिस्ट्रार

16/10/04

*Foged*  
2/3/06  
16/3/06