

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

O.A. No.545 of 2003  
M.A. No.574 of 2003

New Delhi, this the 12th day of March, 2003

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman  
Hon'ble Shri A.P. Nagrath, Member (A)

Mrs. Sumitra Devi  
W/o Satyavir Singh  
R/o Village Madhia Khurd  
PO Dehlawas Gulapur,  
Tehsil Rewari,  
Distt. Mahendragarh,  
Haryana.

....Applicant

(By Advocate : Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat)

Versus

1. Lt. Governor  
Govt of NCT of Delhi  
Through Commissioner of Police,  
Police Headquarters, ITO,  
New Delhi.
2. Dy. Commissioner of Police,  
Provisional Lines, Rajpur Road,  
Delhi. ....Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

By Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman :

MA 574/2003 and OA 545/2003

By virtue of the present application, Mrs. Sumitra Devi - applicant seeks quashing of the order dated 26.10.1989. By virtue of the same, the respondents had cancelled the candidature of the applicant. The applicant seeks that a direction should be issued for issuing the appointment letter to the her to the post of a Constable (Woman).

2. We had put it to the learned counsel for the applicant as to how after expiry of one year of the impugned order dated 26.10.1989, the present application would be within time.

*AS Ag*

3

(2)

3. The answer forthcoming from the bar is that there was some controversy as to whether the applicant is to be treated as a Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe candidate being from 'Bawaria' community and once that question had been settled, the applicant has approached this Tribunal when the similarly situated persons have been granted some relief.

4. The settled principle of law is that the period of limitation, once it starts running would come to an end and the said person would lose his right to enforce any claim after the expiry of the period of limitation. Once that right was lost to the applicant, the Central Administrative Tribunal which draws its powers and strength from the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, will not be in a position, nor it would be appropriate, to exercise any such right.

5. In these circumstances, it is patent that said claim itself, inter alia, necessarily must fail and it can be termed that there is no ground to condone the delay in filing the Original Application. The MA 574/2003 must fail and is dismissed. As a necessary corollary OA must fail and is also dismissed in limine.

*anp*

(A.P. Nagrath)  
Member (A)

*AS Ag*

(V.S. Aggarwal)  
Chairman

/ravi/