

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.8721 of 2017.

Date of Decision: April 27, 2017

Sukhdev Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA.

Present: Mr.Shangara Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

-.-

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

The petitioner assails the order dated 19.02.2015 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, whereby his Original Application claiming appointment in the Railways in terms of the policy to rehabilitate the land-losers, has been dismissed primarily being barred by limitation.

[2] The undisputed facts are that the land owned by the petitioner's father was acquired by the Railways in the year 1980-81 for Diesel Loco Component Works at Patiala. Railways formulated a policy to offer appointment to one member of the family of land-losers. The last date to apply under the said Scheme was extended from time to time and last cut-off date was 31.03.1998. Brother of the petitioner, namely, Jarnail Singh son of Jagir Singh applied for appointment in the year 1989-90 on behalf of the petitioner's family. His name was enlisted at Sr.No.34 amongst the cases sent to the Land Acquisition Collector but eventually his claim was rejected.

[3] The petitioner alleged that he was 12 years' old in the year 1990 when claim of his brother for appointment was turned down. The petitioner

is said to have represented the Railway authorities after attaining majority in the year 1997 but finding no response to the said representation, he filed the instant Original Application before the Tribunal in the year 2015. The Tribunal has dismissed the same being barred by limitation.

[4] As the facts would speak for themselves, the petitioner even as per his own case attained majority in the year 1997. After submitting one representation, he slept over the matter and allowed the grass to grow under his feet. The fact that he chose to approach the Tribunal in the year 2015, namely, after 17-18 years of attaining majority, was sufficient cause for the Tribunal to hold that his claim was hopelessly time barred.

[5] No case to interfere with the order under challenge is made out.

[6] Dismissed.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

April 27, 2017
mohinder

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No