

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

M.A. No. 896 of 2014 with M.A. No. 897 of 2014
(Inre : T.A. No. 364 of 2010)

Hari Baboo Nishad
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>21.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 26.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

O.A. No. 124 of 2014

Prem Singh Negi

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>21.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 26.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 119 of 2010

Ravindra Kumar

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Chief of Army Staff & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>21.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 26.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 163 of 2009 with M.A. No 1340 of 2014

R.V. Prasad

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>20.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 24.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 18 of 2014

R.P. Vishwakarma
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>20.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 25.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 211 of 2009

Liladhar

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>20.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 24.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 01 of 2014

Sarbeswar Pattanaik
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
<p><u>20.11.2014</u></p> <p>One Hon'ble Member of the Bench i.e. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J) is on leave; hence put up on 25.11.2014.</p> <p>I/C Registrar</p> <p>rpm/-</p>	

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

O.A. No. 181 of 2014

Kitabuddin Ansari

Applicant

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondents

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri V.K. Panadey, learned counsel for the applicant, and Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>The present petition has arisen out of Summary Trial.</p> <p>On call of the case it comes out that no Counter Affidavit has been filed by the counsel for respondents and again seeks further time to file the same. The applicant to satisfy the court on the next date whether the Summary Trial can be challenged under Sec 15 of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007.</p> <p>As prayed for by respondents, three weeks time granted to file the counter affidavit. Rejoinder affidavit, if any, may be filed within one week thereafter.</p> <p>List on 10.12.2014 before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) (Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (A) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm.</p>

Form No. 4

[See rule 11(1)]

ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

**M.A. No. 1633 of 2014 with M.A. No 1634 of 2014-11-18
(Inre- O.A. No. 232 of 2012)**

Union of India & Others

Applicants

By Legal Practitioner for Applicants

Versus

Diwan Singh

Respondent

By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This Misc. Application No. 1633 of 2014 for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed by the applicants (Union of India & Others).</p> <p>As per office report, the application for leave to appeal is delayed by 02 months and 29 days.</p> <p>As per provisions of Section 31(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 an application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal.</p> <p>The reason given in the application for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal is not satisfactory and does</p>

not sound enough so as to condone the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal. We also do not find any substantial question of general public importance is involved.

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Office of the Chief Post Master General & others v. Living Media India Ltd. & another** reported in 2012 STPL(LE) 46200 SC has observed that *“condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments”* and since *“the claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.”* The Hon'ble Supreme Court further observed that since *“the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issued involved including the prescribed period of limitation They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings”*

Accordingly, we hereby reject Misc. Application No. 1633 of 2014 for condonation of delay.

Since the application for condonation of delay has been rejected, in consequence thereof the M.A. No 1634 of 2014 for leave to appeal is also rejected.

(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma)
Member (A)

(Justice Abdul Mateen)
Member (J)

rpm.

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

O.A. No. 137 of 2013 with M.A. No. 1315 of 2014

Nk Mukesh Chaudhary
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Cjhief of Army Staff & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p><u>M.A. No. 1315 of 2014.</u></p> <p>Present: Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents, along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This is an application for taking Charge Sheet on record, moved by the learned counsel for the applicant, which has been taken on record. The application is disposed of.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and granted four weeks' time to file Supplementary Counter Affidavit.</p> <p>As prayed, list on 17.12.2014 before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm.</p>

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 515 of 2010

Shyam Sunder
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>19.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri P.N. Chaturvedi, learned counsel for the applicant, and Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>On call of the case. Shri Rajesh Kumar, advocate states that Shri D.S. Tiwari, learned standing counsel is out of station, as such the case be adjourned. Accordingly, the case is adjourned for the day.</p> <p>As prayed, list on 11.12.2014 before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm.</p>

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

M.A. No. 1596 of 2014 with M.A. No. 1597 of 2014
(Inre: O.A. No. 103 of 2012)

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Rajender Singh

By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri R.S. Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This Misc. Application No. 1596 of 2014 for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed by the applicants (Union of India & Others).</p> <p>As per office report, the application for leave to appeal is delayed by 02 years, 06 months and 14 days.</p> <p>As per provisions of Section 31(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 an application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal.</p> <p>The reason given in the application for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal is not satisfactory and does not sound enough so as to condone the delay in filing the application</p>

for leave to appeal. We also do not find any substantial question of general public importance is involved.

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Office of the Chief Post Master General & others v. Living Media India Ltd. & another** reported in 2012 STPL(LE) 46200 SC has observed that *“condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments”* and since *“the claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.”* The Hon'ble Supreme Court further observed that since *“the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issued involved including the prescribed period of limitation They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings”*

Accordingly, we hereby reject Misc. Application No. 1596 of 2014 for condonation of delay.

Since the application for condonation of delay has been rejected, in consequence thereof the M.A. No 1597 of 2014 for leave to appeal is also rejected.

(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma)
Member (A)

(Justice Abdul Mateen)
Member (J)

rpm.

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

M.A. No. 1598 of 2014 with M.A. No. 1599 of 2014
(Inre: O.A. No. 80 of 2013)

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Applicants

Applicants

Versus

Atar Singh

By Legal Practitioner for Respondent

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri R.S. Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This Misc. Application No. 1598 of 2014 for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed by the applicants (Union of India & Others).</p> <p>As per office report, the application for leave to appeal is delayed by 01 year, 06 months and 26 days.</p> <p>As per provisions of Section 31(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 an application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal.</p> <p>The reason given in the application for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal is not satisfactory and does not sound enough so as to condone the delay in filing the application</p>

for leave to appeal. We also do not find any substantial question of general public importance is involved.

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Office of the Chief Post Master General & others v. Living Media India Ltd. & another** reported in *2012 STPL(LE) 46200 SC* has observed that *“condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments”* and since *“the claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.”* The Hon'ble Supreme Court further observed that since *“the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issued involved including the prescribed period of limitation They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings”*

Accordingly, we hereby reject Misc. Application No. 1598 of 2014 for condonation of delay.

Since the application for condonation of delay has been rejected, in consequence thereof the M.A. No 1599 of 2014 for leave to appeal is also rejected

(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma)
Member (A)

(Justice Abdul Mateen)
Member (J)

rpm.

Form No. 4

[See rule 11(1)]

ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

O.A. No. 209 of 2013 with M.A. No. 1006 of 2014

Hav Daroga Rai

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Chief of Army Staff & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>18.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri Ishraq Farooqui, learned counsel for the respondents, along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>On call of the case Dr. Ashish Ashthana, advocate, appeared and states that Col(Retd) Ashok Kumar and Rohit Kumar, learned counsels for the applicant are not come to the court today and prays for adjournment of the case. Accordingly, the case is adjourned for the day.</p> <p>As prayed, list on 08.01.2015 before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm/-.</p>

Form No. 4

[See rule 11(1)]

ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

DY-No. 1713 of 2014

Pramesh

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Memo of appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Kumar on behalf of respondents no. 1 to 4 is taken on record. When the case is next listed his name be shown as counsel for the said respondents.</p> <p>Present: Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents, along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>List has been revised. No one appears on behalf of the applicant, neither there is any request to adjourn/pass over the case.</p> <p>Accordingly, Dy-No. 1713 of 2014 is dismissed for non-prosecution.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm/-.</p>

Form No. 4

[See rule 11(1)]

ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

DY-No. 1713 of 2014

Pramesh

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Memo of appearance filed by Shri Rajesh Kumar on behalf of respondents no. 1 to 4 is taken on record. When the case is next listed his name be shown as counsel for the said respondents.</p> <p>Present: Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents, along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>List has been revised. No one appears on behalf of the applicant, neither there is any request to adjourn/pass over the case.</p> <p>Accordingly, Dy-No. 1713 of 2014 is dismissed for non-prosecution.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm/-.</p>

Form No. 4

[See rule 11(1)]

ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

**M.A. No. 1585 of 2014 with M.A. No. 1586 of 2014
(Inre: O.A. No. 294 of 2012)**

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicants

Versus

Ram Bhajan Singh

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondent

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri R.S. Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This Misc. Application No. 1585 of 2014 for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed by the applicants (Union of India & Others).</p> <p>As per office report, the application for leave to appeal is delayed by 02 years, 02 months and 01 day.</p> <p>As per provisions of Section 31(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 an application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal.</p> <p>The reason given in the application for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal is not satisfactory and does</p>

not sound enough so as to condone the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal. We also do not find any substantial question of general public importance is involved.

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Office of the Chief Post Master General & others v. Living Media India Ltd. & another** reported in 2012 STPL(LE) 46200 SC has observed that *“condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments”* and since *“the claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.”* The Hon'ble Supreme Court further observed that since *“the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issued involved including the prescribed period of limitation They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings”*

Accordingly, we hereby reject Misc. Application No. 1585 of 2014 for condonation of delay.

Since the application for condonation of delay has been rejected, in consequence thereof the M.A. No 1586 of 2014 for leave to appeal is also rejected

(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma)
Member (A)

(Justice Abdul Mateen)
Member (J)

rpm.

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

M.A. No. 1594 of 2014 with M.A. No. 1595 of 2014
(Inre: O.A. No. 330 of 2012)

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicants

Versus

Devendra Kumar & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri R.S. Mishra, learned counsel for the applicant along with Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>This Misc. Application No. 1594 of 2014 for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal has been filed by the applicants (Union of India & Others).</p> <p>As per office report, the application for leave to appeal is delayed by 02 years, 01 month and 17 days.</p> <p>As per provisions of Section 31(2) of the Armed Forces Tribunal Act, 2007 an application to the Tribunal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court shall be made within a period of thirty days beginning with the date of the decision of the Tribunal.</p> <p>The reason given in the application for condoning the delay in filing the application for leave to appeal is not satisfactory and does not sound enough so as to condone the delay in filing the application</p>

for leave to appeal. We also do not find any substantial question of general public importance is involved.

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Office of the Chief Post Master General & others v. Living Media India Ltd. & another** reported in 2012 STPL(LE) 46200 SC has observed that *“condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments”* and since *“the claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.”* The Hon'ble Supreme Court further observed that since *“the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issued involved including the prescribed period of limitation They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings”*

Accordingly, we hereby reject Misc. Application No. 1594 of 2014 for condonation of delay.

Since the application for condonation of delay has been rejected, in consequence thereof the M.A. No. 1595 of 2014 for leave to appeal is also rejected

(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma)
Member (A)

(Justice Abdul Mateen)
Member (J)

PG.

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

O.A. No. 195 of 2011

Vivek Kumar

By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Shri BPS Chauhan, learned counsel for the applicant, and Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>On call of the case a person claiming himself to be Vivek Kumar, applicant, appeared and states that his counsel, Shri P.N. Chaturvedi, could not come to this Court today. He, therefore, prays for adjournment of the case. Accordingly, the case is adjourned for the day.</p> <p>As prayed, list on 28.01.2015 before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm/.</p>

Form No. 4
[See rule 11(1)]
ORDER SHEET

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Court No. 3

T.A. No. 1288 of 2010

Chandra Bhushan Yadav
By Legal Practitioner for Applicant

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others
By Legal Practitioner for Respondents

Respondents

Notes of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
	<p><u>17.11.2014</u> <u>Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abdul Mateen, Member (J)</u> <u>Hon'ble Lt. Gen. A.M. Verma, Member (A)</u></p> <p>Present: Capt. Priti Tyagi, Departmental Representative.</p> <p>On call of the case Shri Virat Anand, advocate, holding brief of Shri M.S. Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant, appeared and prays for adjournment of the case. As such matter adjourned. We have gone through the orders and it comes out that the petition has not yet been admitted.</p> <p>Accordingly, we direct that the matter be listed on 07.01.2015 for admission, before the appropriate Court having jurisdiction, as per roster.</p> <p>(Lt. Gen A.M. Verma) Member (A)</p> <p>(Justice Abdul Mateen) Member (J)</p> <p>rpm/.</p>