

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No.255/2018.

Date of Decision: 03.05.2018.

CORAM: HON'BLE SHRI ARVIND J. ROHEE, MEMBER (J)

Shri Pardeshi Lal Sagar,
 Aged 45 years,
 working as SSE (Quarterly Inspection),
 under Senior DEE (TRS) Kalva
 Residing at Section 32,
 Near Ganesh Laundry,
 Sitaram Nagar, Ulhasnagar 4.
(By Advocate Shri Vicky Nagrani)

.... ***Applicant***

Versus

1. The Union of India, through
 the General Manager,
 Central Railway, CSTM, Mumbai.

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
 Central Railway,
 Mumbai Division, CSTM,
 Mumbai 400 001.

3. CEE (RS),
 CST Mumbai.

4. Assistant Divisional Railway Manager,
 Central Railway, Mumbai Division,
 CSTM, Mumbai – 1.

5. Dy. CEE (EMU),
 Matunga.

... ***Respondents***

ORDER (Oral)

Per : Shri A.J. Rohee, Member (J)

Today Division Bench is not
 available. Hence, the matter is taken up
 before Single Bench for Admission.

2. Heard Shri V.A. Nagrani, learned Advocate for the Applicant. I have carefully perused the case record.

3. The Applicant is presently working as SSE (Quarterly Inspection) under Senior DEE (TRS) Kalva, Ulhasnagar District Thane. In this OA, he has come up with the grievance regarding order imposing penalty of 'withholding of increment for a period of three years on Non-cumulative basis'. This order is of 27.06.2009. The Appellate Authority confirmed the said order and Revisional Authority too on 23.02.2016. The present OA is filed on 21.09.2017 i.e. after a period of one year from the date the impugned order passed by the Revisional Authority.

4. On scrutiny of OA, the office has drawn up the following office objections:

- “1. *Index incomplete.*
2. *All Address are incomplete.*
3. *Synopsis not filed.*
4. *Verification incomplete.*
5. *Typed copies of p.22 to 26 not given.*
6. *MP for Condonation of delay not filed.*
7. *Verification not signed.”*

5. However, in spite of lapse of eight months, those office objections are not yet complied with. Learned Advocate for

Applicant again seeks four weeks time. However no steps were taken for removing the office objections and time is being sought on the ground that some documents are to be collected by the applicant by taking recourse to the provisions of Right to Information Act.

6. In such circumstances of the case, request for further time is not justified. The OA, therefore, stands dismissed for failing to remove the office objections in spite of sufficient time having been granted. The Applicant will have the liberty to file fresh OA, which will however be subject to law of limitation as provided under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

7. Registry is directed to forward certified copy of this order to both the parties at the earliest.

(A.J.Rohee)
Member (J)

dm.