

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

**RA No.226/2015
OA No.2470/2014**

New Delhi, this the 29th day of November, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)**

1. General Manager
Northern Railway
Baroda House,
New Delhi.
2. Divisional Railway Manager
DRM Officer, Northern Railway,
Estate Entry Road,
New Delhi.
3. Senior Divisional Personnel Officer
DRM Office, Northern Railway,
Estate Entry Road,
New Delhi.review applicants.

(By Advocate : Shri Satpal Singh)

Versus

Govind Lal
Aged about 55 years,
S/o Shri Kanwar Singh
Working as Loco Pilot (Goods) in Delhi Division
Presently posted as Crew Controller, New Delhi

R/o 405/24, Front of Shani Mandir
Near Head Post Office,
Bahadurgarh (Haryana). review respondent/
applicant in OA.

(By Advocate : Shri Yogesh Sharma)

: O R D E R (ORAL) :

Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman :

This review has been filed in respect to order dated 09.03.2015 passed in OA No.2470/2014. The review was presented on 28.07.2015, i.e., after a considerable delay. The review applicants have filed MA No.2881/2015 seeking condonation of delay on 20.08.2015. The

grounds urged in the said application as contained in para 2 are reproduced as under:-

“2. That there is some delay in filing Review Petition as after receiving the copy of order passed by Hon’ble Court, matter was placed before competent authority of Railway Department. It is submitted that after due consideration, it was decided to file Review Petition in the aforesaid OA on certain grounds/reasons, as stated in the petition. It is submitted that thereafter, matter was referred to the counsel for drafting Review Petition and it is thus some delay had occurred in filing the Review Petition.”

2. From the perusal of the aforesaid averments, we find that no details have been indicated as to in what manner the delay is justified. As a matter of fact, all the averments are so sketchy and vague that it does not lead to any inference that the delay is bonafide. We are not convinced with the grounds for condonation of delay. Delay condonation application is rejected. Thus, without going into the merits of the controversy, this RA is dismissed on the ground of limitation.

(Shekhar Agarwal)
Member (A)

(Justice Permod Kohli)
Chairman

/pj/