

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH
CIRCUIT SITTINGS: BILASPUR

Original Application No.203/00308/2019

Bilaspur, this Thursday, the 04th day of April, 2019

HON'BLE SHRI NAVIN TANDON, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER

Surrendra Singh Thakur
S/o Shri B.S. Thakur,
Aged about 44 years
R/o Station Chowk Bodhan
Gali District Raigarh
Chhattisgarh PIN 496001

-Applicant

(By Advocate-Shri Kunal Das)

V e r s u s

Union of India,
Through Ministry of Textiles
Weavers Service Centre
15-A Mama Parmanand Marg
Mumbai 400004
(By Advocate-Shri Vivek Verma)

- Respondent

O R D E R (Oral)

By Navin Tandon, AM:-

The applicant is aggrieved by his non selection by the respondent-department as Art Designer.

2. The applicant has sought for the following reliefs in this Original Application:-

“8.1 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents authority to give appointment to the present applicant with effect from 2004.

8.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly quash/set aside the impugned order dated 24.02.2004 which is passed by the respondent No.2.

8.3 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call the entire record of the present applicant.

8.4 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to give their entire service benefit i.e. promotion, seniority, increment, which is due to him including the other monetary benefits also.

8.5 That, this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief(s), which is deemed fit and proper in the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case."

3. It is seen that the applicant was called for interview on 25.10.2004 vide letter dated 06.10.2004 (Annexure A-1) for the post of Art Designer. Thereafter, the applicant had submitted his representation dated 29.03.2006 (Annexure A/2).

3.1 Subsequently he has obtained information through Right to Information Act, 2005 in the year 2016 wherein he has been informed vide letter dated 09.10.2018 (Annexure A/9) that as per merit position the applicant was at Serial No.1 in the said selection.

3.2. The applicant is seeking appointment w.e.f.2004.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents appearing in advance notice submits that the applicant has filed this Original Application after an inordinate delay of more than 10 years and the applicant has not filed any application for condoning such delay. Therefore

the present Original Application may be dismissed on the ground of limitation itself.

5. We find that the applicant submitted a representation to the respondents in the year 2006. After that he approached the respondents in the year 2016 for obtaining information under RTI Act, 2005.

6. This Original Application has been filed after more than 13 years of his representation. This is barred by limitation under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. Hence the Original Application is dismissed in limine.

(Ramesh Singh Thakur)
Judicial Member

(Navin Tandon)
Administrative Member

kc