

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 7847 of 2019**

Purna Chandra Mandi Retd Lab Assistant S/o Mohan Chandra Mandi
Presently Residing At C/o K. L. Das House No 237/3, Sector -3, Behind
30-Block, Balaji Nagar Shivanand Nagar Raipur Chhattisgarh 492008

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union of India Through The Secretary, Department of Personnel And Training, North Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi, Delhi 110001
2. Chairman Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, 61, 35, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi, Delhi 110001
3. Deputy Registrar Central Administrative Tribunal, Caravs Complex, 15, Civil Lines, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh 482001

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri A.V. Shridhar, Advocate.
For Respondent/UOI	: Shri B.Gopa Kumar, Assistant Solicitor General.

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge****Order on Board****P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****23.09.2019**

1. The Petitioner has moved this Court expressing the grievance with regard to delay in passing the final verdict in Original Application No.717 of 2015 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur Bench, despite the fact that the matter was finally heard on 06.12.2018, as revealed from Annexure P/1.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner points out that after hearing the Original Application, the Petitioner suffered a paralytic stroke which has virtually incapacitated him from subscribing the signature in the affidavit and hence

has put the 'LTI'. The plight of the Petitioner is pointed out only to highlight the prejudice, which is stated as being caused because of the delay, more so, when he is occupying a post of lower level in the hierarchy. The learned counsel also makes a reference to Rule 105 of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Rules of Practice, 1993 and the law declared by the Apex Court in the matter of **R.C. Sharma v. Union of India, (1976) 3 SCC 574**, with regard to the adverse consequences which may be resulted because of inordinate delay in passing the verdict after the final hearing.

3. We heard the learned Assistant Solicitor General as well.
4. After hearing both the sides and considering the facts and circumstances, we are of the view that, it is quite desirable to have the final verdict in the Original Application pronounced at the earliest. We dispose off the matter expressing the hope and desire that the final verdict would be pronounced by the Tribunal in the above circumstances, as expeditiously as possible.

Sd/-

(P.R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge