

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 ~~requisite~~ ^{Contra} order on the wrong premises. The review applicants are only seeking to re-argue the case, which does not come under ~~purview~~ the ^{purview} of the review.

4. In the circumstances, the EA is dismissed.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

/sunil/