

(17)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA 201/2002
in
OA 2366/2001

New Delhi, this the 9th day of September, 2002
Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

Rup Kumar (applicant No.2 in OA) ...Applicant

Vs.

Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors. Respondents

O R D E R (IN CIRCULATION)

By Hon'ble Sh. Govindan S. Tampi,

RA 201/2002 has been filed by Sh. Rup Kumar, applicant No.2 in OA No. 2366/2001, seeking the recall and review of the order dt. 3-6-2002, disposing of the OA.

2. I have considered the matter with specific reference to the points raised in the RA. OA No. 2366/2001 had been filed by two individuals, seeking among others grant of temporary status/regularisation, revision of the wages etc. While examining the OA, it was found that the grant of temporary status/regularisation of casual workers in terms of DOPT's Scheme for the purpose of 10-9-93 would be applicable to only one of the applicants who was in position when the Scheme was formulated - as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the decisions in Punjab State Electricity Board & Anr. Vs. Wazir Singh (JT 2002 (3) SC 49) and UOI & Anr. Vs. Mohan Pal & Ors (JT 2002 (4) SCALE)-and, therefore, the OA was allowed only in the case of applicant No. 1 and not in the case of applicant No.2. Sh. Rup Kumar the present review applicant, without disputing the validity of the decision, issued in the wake of the ^{directions} ~~decisions~~ of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is prayed in the RA that reliefs other than grant of temporary

status/regularisation, sought by the applicant should have been considered.

3. On examining the issue once again, I am convinced that the order sought to be reviewed by the applicant does not suffer from any error. Grant of temporary status and regularisation are the reliefs sought for in the OA with other reliefs thrown in as additional reliefs. ~~Once~~ The main issue has been decided upon following the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Punjab SEB's case & Mohan Pal's case (supra). One applicant who fulfilled the requirements as given ~~the~~ benefit and by the same reason, the other applicant who did not fulfill the requirement was denied the benefit. No other relief was expected to be given. Still it has been indicated in my order relating to applicant No.2 that "he can, as respondents have correctly stated, apply for group D post in respondents' organisation when vacancies arise and application are called for, provided he fulfills the qualifications and his case would be considered in accordance with the Rules and instructions". This would take care of the other reliefs. ~~Nothing~~, Nothing further could have been asked for or granted.

4. In view of the above, I am convinced that no case for recall/review of my order dt. 3-6-02 has been made out in the application. RA fails and is accordingly rejected.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
M (A)