

(S)

Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench

Review Application No.19 of 2003 in
Original Application No.3210 of 2002

New Delhi, this the 24th day of February, 2003

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

Ms. Surjeet Kaur Dhami,
Ex. Senior Accountant,
D/o Shri Ram Singh,
R/o D-158, Sarojini Nagar,
New Delhi

.... Applicant

(By Advocate: None)

Versus

1. Union of India through,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Through : Principal Accounts Office,
North Block, New Delhi-1.
2. Deputy Controller of Accounts,
Principal Accounts Office (CENSUS),
North Block, New Delhi-1
3. Mr. Azad
Sr. Accounts Officer
Principal Accounts Office (CENSUS),
North Block, New Delhi-1

.... Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman

The applicant had filed O.A. 3210/2002. The same was disposed of with the following findings:

"On totality of facts and considering the nature of the assertion, we are of the considered opinion and with the peculiar facts that the said contention which should be taken altogether have little to support the claim of the applicant. It is true that the adverse entries had not been communicated within three months of the recording of the same. But admittedly the same had been communicated. They pertained to the irregularity of the applicant in attending her office and not obtaining total punctuality. The representation of the applicant in this regard had been rejected. Once the entries had been communicated, indeed no prejudice in this regard is caused because the representation has been considered and did not find favour with the applicant.

(Signature)

M

-2-

5. At this stage, we find no reasons to quash aforesaid entries. Once the entries stand, the irresistible conclusion would be that the applicant was rightly denied the benefits of the said Scheme."

By virtue of the present application, the applicant seeks review of the said order.

2. None has appeared on behalf of the applicant despite the matter having been listed. On perusal of the application seeking review, it is patent that the contentions raised have been considered. There is no error apparent on the face of the record to prompt us to go behind the earlier order because it was considered and decided that there was little ground for quashing the remarks that had been recorded against the applicant.

3. Resultantly the review application being without merit must fail and is dismissed.

V.K. Majotra

(V.K. Majotra)

Member(A)

V.S. Aggarwal

(V.S. Aggarwal)

Chairman

/dkm/