

(1)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No. 281/2001

IN

OA No. 1088/2001

New Delhi: this the 24th day of August, 2001

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

S. K. Chawla,
A-105, Pandara Road,
New Delhi-3

.....Applicant.

Versus

1. Union of India
through Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development &
Poverty Alleviation,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-11.
 2. The Secretary,
Deptt. of Pers. & Trg.
North Block,
New Delhi-1
 3. The Director General (Works),
CPWD, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-11.
 4. The Chairman,
Screening Committee for
Diploma Holders Asstt. Engrs. of CPWD
for eligibility to promotion as
Executive Engineers
through Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Development & PA
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-11
 5. Secretary, UPSC, Shahjehan Road, New Delhi.
And Sl. 6 to 9 as per Memo of parties.
-Respondents.
- ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

S. R. Adige, VC(A):

Perused the RA.

2. In our order dated 11.7.2001 in OA No. 1088/2001 we have declined to issue any interlocutory directions to the 3 Member Screening Committee when it was still to submit its recommendations. While coming to this conclusion we have observed that the screening by the 3 Member Committee is only ^{the first} stage in the process and the 3 Member Committee as well as the review OPC should be allowed to complete the task

assigned to it without any interlocutory directions at this stage. We have made it clear that if upon completion of the process any grievance survives it will always be open after exhausting such departmental remedies as available to him to agitate his grievance in accordance with law, if so advised. Thus while applicant's rights to agitate his legitimate grievance at the appropriate stage remain inviolate, the process leading up to the final decision can also go ahead without judicial interference at an interlocutory stage.

3. In holding thus, we have only followed the ruling of a co-ordinate Bench of this Tribunal in its order dated 24.1.2001 in similar OA No.510/2000 Shyam Lal & another Vs. UOI & Ors., where also the Bench had declined to pass interlocutory order laying down detailed criteria for making the selection, noting inter alia that the concerned authorities were themselves bound to follow the criteria laid down by court judgments and if at the end, any employee still remained aggrieved, he was at liberty to seek remedial action.

4. We may mention here that the grounds taken in the RA do not bring it within the scope and ambit of section 22(3)(f) AT Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC under which alone any order/decision of the Tribunal can be reviewed.

5. R.A rejected.

A. Vedarani
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
MEMBER (J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

/ug/