

3

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

R.A.NO.213/2002 IN OA 395/2001

Friday, this the 17th day of January, 2003

Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Union of India & Others ...Applicants
(By Advocate: Shri Lalita Prasad for Shri B.S.Jain)

Versus

Shri Ravinder Kumar Choudhary ...Respondent
(By Advocate: Shri B.S.Mainee).

O R D E R (ORAL)

Heard Shri Lalita Prasad, learned proxy counsel
for the review applicants and Shri B.S. Mainee, counsel
for respondent.

2. This RA has been filed literally challenging the
order passed by me on 14.5.2002 in OA-395/2001. While
disposing of the aforesaid OA, the following directions
were given to the review applicants:

"6. I have considered the matter. That
the applicant was originally engaged as
Casual Worker and granted temporary
status are admitted. His placement in
the seniority list is also not disputed.
However, according to the respondents, he
had only 1139 days, and only those with
more than 1800 days have been
regularised. Applicant's plea is that if
his services were not dispensed with, he
would have crossed 1800 days in neither
here nor there. Actual working days are
the criterion and if the applicant did
not have the requisite days he would have
no case. However, if those who are
placed below him in the seniority list
have been regularised, denying the
applicant the same would be improper.

7. In the above view of the matter, I
dispose of this OA with directions that
the respondents shall, consider the case
of the applicant for regularisation, if
anyone shown below him (at Sl.No. 29) in
the temporary status list dated
22.09.1994, issued by the respondents has



4
(2)

in fact been regularised. This shall be done within three months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order and as and when it is done, he would also be entitled for all consequential benefit except back wages. No costs."

3. Now, the review applicants seek to have the order upset by stating that the error has ~~been~~ crept in into the order and the Tribunal has passed the ~~required~~ ^{concerns} order on the wrong premises. The review applicants are only seeking to re-argue the case, which does not come under the ~~preview~~ ^{purview} of the review.

4. In the circumstances, the RA is dismissed.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

/sunil/