

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

O.A. No.2391/2015

Reserved on : 02.05.2019

Pronounced on : 06.05.2019

**HON'BLE MR. V. AJAY KUMAR, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MS. NITA CHOWDHURY, MEMBER (A)**

N.D. Qureshi, aged about 78 years (PS to DG)
S/o H. Ziauddin
30, Park End Colony, Vikas Marg,
Delhi-110092. ...Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.I. Alam)

Versus

1. Director General
Employees State Insurance Corporation,
Panchdeep Bhavan, CIG Road,
New Delhi-110002.
2. Secretary to the Government of India
Department of Personnel & Training (DOP&T)
North Block, New Delhi-11001.
3. Secretary,
Union Public Service Commission,
Dhoplur House,
Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi-110011. ...Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Yakesh Anand)

ORDER

By Shri V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)

The applicant, who retired from service on 30.11.1994, filed the instant OA on 08.06.2015 claiming an amount of Rs.7,01,18,820/- from the Ist respondent, i.e., Employees State Insurance Corporation (in short ESIC) by submitting that the respondent-ESIC not promoted him to the post of Private Secretary to the Director General on due date and had they promoted him as

such, he would have been entitled to the said amount by way of his salary and other benefits.

2. Heard Shri S.I. Alam, the learned counsel for the applicant and Shri Yakesh Anand, the learned counsel for the respondents and perused the pleadings on record.

3. A bare perusal of the pleadings of the OA clearly indicates that the same is not only abnormally belated but also frivolous. It was the case of the applicant that his claim for promotion to the post of Private Secretary to the Director General was not considered in the year 1973, in spite of his request. The applicant having not challenged the said alleged illegal action of the respondents for all these long years, filed the OA in the year 2015, i.e. for more than 40 years, filed the instant OA claiming release of an amount of Rs.7,01,18,820/- from the respondents by stating that had he been promoted, he would have earned that money.

4. In the circumstances, the OA is dismissed not only on the ground of limitation but also on merits. No costs.

(NITA CHOWDHURY)
Member (A)

(V. AJAY KUMAR)
Member (J)

RKS