

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI.**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 52 OF 2019

Date Of Decision:- 18th January, 2019.

**CORAM: R. VIJAYKUMAR, MEMBER (A).
RAVINDER KAUR, MEMBER (J).**

Shri Prashant Kumar S/o Shri Janardhan Singh,
Age 25 years, RRC Candidates,
At & Post Ghoswari,
Bhaktiyapur, PIN 803 112
(Applicant by Advocate Shri. D.N. Karande)

...Applicant.

Versus

1. The Union of India,
Through, the General Manager,
Central Railway, 1st Floor of GM's
Office Building, CSTM,
Mumbai-400 001.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
Central Railway,
1s Floor of General Manager's
Office,, CSTM Mumbai-400 001.
3. The Chairman,
Central Railway's Railway Recruitment
Cell, 1st Floor of Chief Project Manager
(Conversion) Office Building,
P.D.Mello Road,
Wadi Bunder, Mumbai-400 010.

...Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

PER:- R. VIJAYKUMAR, MEMBER (A).

1. Today, when the case was called for admission, heard
Shri. D.N. Karande, learned counsel for applicant. We have
carefully perused the case records.

2. Heard the learned counsel on the issue that the respondents have issued three provisional pensions first on 30.09.2015, the second on date Nil and the third on 10.07.2017.

3. It is apparent that the applicant had a right to take legal remedies within one year from first part panel published on 30.09.2015 but it would appear that the respondents continued to use this selection list till 10.07.2017 when they published a third provisional part panel. Even from this date, the applicant could have filed his OA within one year but he did so only on 14.11.2018 without any MA seeking for condonation of delay. The learned counsel for applicant has no explanation for the time lapse but argues on Para 3 in the OA that he was under the impression that the final panel would be issued.

4. Be that as it may, this application contends that the respondents wrongly rejected his application for selection on the basis that he had not mentioned his IPO number in the application form and this was done after the stage of documents verification and after completion of medical examination and payment of medical fees. In his application before this Tribunal, the applicant has not chosen to substantiate this allegation by enclosing a copy of the original form of application filed with the Selection Committee nor has he provided a counter foil of

the IPO which would have enabled the respondents, in the first instance, to verify if they had committed any error and which they could have taken cognizance.

5. As discussed above, the applicant has provided no material in support of his claim and therefore, it is held that the application is devoid of substance and is accordingly dismissed at the admission stage without any order as to costs.

(Ravinder Kaur)
Member (J)

(R. Vijaykumar)
Member (A)

srp
JW
1/2

The first part of the report is devoted to a description of the work done during the last year. It is divided into two main sections: a general survey of the work done and a detailed account of the results obtained. The second part of the report is devoted to a discussion of the results obtained and to a comparison of the results with those obtained in previous years. The third part of the report is devoted to a summary of the work done and to a list of references.

Dr. J. J. Thomson

Dr. J. J. Thomson