

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

R.A. NO. 248/2002
in
O.A. NO. 2755/2001

This the 26th day of October, 2002.

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE V.S.AGGARWAL, CHAIRMAN

HON'BLE SHRI V. K. MAJOTRA, MEMBER (J)

K.C.Lohani & Anr.

... Applicants

-versus-

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

Hon'ble Shri V.K.Majotra, Member (A) :

This application has been made seeking review of order dated 12.9.2002 in OA No.2755/2001.

2. It has been stated that as applicants had appeared in the Limited Departmental Competitive Examination held in 1988, it should be deemed that their names had been included in the select list of 1988, though the result of the examination was declared on 30.11.1989. According to applicants, it has been held that applicants' names were not included in the select list of 1988 and they had not completed 12 years of service at the time of issuance of letter dated 22.8.2000. According to them, as they had appeared in the examination held in December, 1988, the findings in the Tribunal's order were an error apparent on record. They have relied on the notice dated 2.7.1988 relating to the 1988 examination as also the result thereof published in Employment News dated 18-24 November, 1989 to contend that they belong to the select list of 1988 and,

W

therefore, should be given benefit of in situ promotion w.e.f. 21.8.2000. In these references, nowhere it is stated that candidates appearing in examination to be held in 1988 would belong to the selection of 1988 and even though their results are declared later on and the promotion is accorded thereafter, it would be deemed that they belong to the selection of 1988 and their promotion will take effect from 1988, even before declaration of result and the date of assumption of charge.

3. Although applicants appeared in the examination held in 1988, the result thereof was declared in 1989 and the promotion was also accorded to them from the date of assumption of the duties of Stenographer Gr. "B". Applicants have misconceived that there is an error apparent in the Tribunal's order of 12.9.2002. Various competitive examinations are held by the UPSC and other selection bodies. These examinations may be held in a particular year but allocation of batches or selection years are always those when the results are declared. For example, if the combined Civil Services Examination is held in the year, say 1988 and the result is declared in 1989, those selected will be said to belong to 1989 batch of a particular Civil Service. The terms and conditions on the subject of in situ promotion of Private Secretaries to the level of Principal Private Secretary were laid down in Annexure A-7 dated 21.8.2000 and applicants were rightly denied the claim for inclusion in the select list for the year up to 1988 for purposes of in situ promotion.

W

(4)

- 3 -

4. We do not find any error apparent on the record. The sole purpose of the review applicants has been to re-argue the entire case, which does not fall within the ambit and scope of a review application.

5. This review application is accordingly dismissed in circulation.

V.K.Majotra

(V. K. Majotra)
Member (A)

V.S.Agg

(V. S. Aggarwal)
Chairman

/as/