

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

R.A.261/2001 IN
O.A.1251/2001

Monday, this the 6th day of August, 2001

HON'BLE SHRI S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (ADMN)

1. Kanchid Mal
S/o Shri Sumer Singh
I/141, Khichripur, Delhi-110 091
2. Puran Chand
S/o Shri Gobind Ram
A-68, Gali No.5,
Fulara House
East Vinod Nagar, Delhi-110 091
3. Pawan Kumar,
S/o Shri Manturi Singh,
F-71, Harijan Basti,
Kondli, Delhi-110 096
4. Rajendra Singh,
S/o Shri Lakhami Singh,
10/160-161, Khichripur,
Delhi-110 091
5. Rakesh Kumar Beniwal,
S/o Shri Mushilal Beniwal,
D-39, Kondli,
Delhi-110 096
6. Dinesh Kumar,
S/o Shri Harbir Singh
1466, Kalyanwas,
Delhi - 110 091
7. Rohtas Kumar,
S/o Shri Harbir Singh,
9/141, Khichripur,
Delhi - 110 091
8. Jitendra Kumar,
S/o Late Bhola Singh,
E-30, Ganesh Nagar Complex,
Pandev Nagar,
Delhi - 110 092
9. Mohammad Jahangir Alam,
S/o Late Budra-ud-din,
J-20, Sundar Nagari,
Delhi - 110 093

.... Applicants

Versus

1. The Director,
Department of Health Services,
Government of N.C.T. Delhi,
E-6, Block, Saraswati Bhawan,
Connaught Place,
New Delhi - 110 001

d

2

(2)

2. Chief Medical Officer,
Department of Health Services,
Government of N.C.T. Delhi
E-6, Block, Saraswati Bhawan,
Connaught Place,
Delhi - 110 001

3. Medical Superintendent
Lal Bahadur Shastri Hospital,
Khichripur,
Delhi - 110 091 Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

By Hon'ble Shri S.A.I. Rizvi, Member (A) :

The present RA has been filed seeking review and recall of the Judgement & order dated 17.5.2001 passed by this Tribunal (Single Bench) in OA No. 1251/2001.

2. After a perusal of the aforesaid RA, I find that the review applicants have, by and large, attempted a re-argument of the case by agitating once again some of the issues which they had raised in the aforesaid OA. The points raised in the aforesaid OA and the arguments advanced on behalf of the applicants were considered by the Tribunal at sufficient length before deciding the aforesaid OA.

3. The ground taken in the RA is that all the relevant facts of the case could not be placed before the Tribunal at the time of consideration of the OA. The review applicants have in particular advanced the argument that the applicants being Class IV employees could not supply all the relevant details to their advocate in the O.A. According to them, the applicants could have been considered for

d

3

(3)

regularisation in terms of the Scheme of 1993 which has been applied to post 1993 cases also. The aforesaid plea, I find, was not taken at the time of consideration of the O.A. and no time was sought by the applicants to enable them to place any other material/record before the Tribunal. In the circumstances, the aforesaid plea taken in the RA has little force and deserves to be rejected.

4. After further consideration of the matter, I also do not find any error occurring on the face of the record nor I find any other justification which may require review of the aforesaid order under Order XLVII Rule 1 of the CPC read with Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

5. In sum, the present RA is rejected.



(S.A.T. RIZVI)
MEMBER (A)

/pkr/