

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA No. 24/99 in OA 199/98

New Delhi, this the 27th day of January, 1999

HON'BLE SHRI T.N. BHAT, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE SHRI S.P. BISWAS, MEMBER (A)

15

In the matter of:

Shri Virender Prakash,
S/o Shri Balram Singh Yadav,
R/o Barrack No. 2, Police Station,
Lodhi Colony,
New Delhi.

...Review applicant

Vs.

1. The Chairman,
Staff Selection Commission,
Block No. 12, CGO Complex,
Lodhi Road,
New Delhi.
2. The Commissioner of Police,
Delhi, M.S.O. Building, I.T.O.,
New Delhi.

..Respondents

ORDER (BY Circulation)

delivered by Hon'ble Shri T.N. Bhat, Member (J)

The review applicant had filed O.A. No. 199/98 seeking directions to the respondents to consider his case and to interview him for the post of Sub Inspector. The applicant's case had been rejected by the respondents on the ground that he did not fulfil the requisite physical standards, in that, his vision was not according to those standards.

2. After hearing both the parties, by our judgement/order dated 24.11.1998 we allowed the O.A. to

27.1.99


the extent of directing respondents no. 1 & 2 to constitute a special Medical Board consisting of not less than three Ophthalmologists in the AIIMS, New Delhi to test the vision of the applicant. It needs to be stated here that the applicant had also made a similar request before filing the O.A. which request was rejected by the respondents and it was contended by the applicant in his O.A. that respondent no. 1 had by the order impugned in the O.A. refused to provide to the applicant another opportunity to appear before a Medical Board for having his vision tested.


3. Now the applicant has filed this review application seeking out right direction to the respondents to interview the applicant and not to insist upon his passing a fresh vision test, as the applicant had already passed a vision test when he was selected as a Constable.

4. Having considered the request of the applicant in RA and the contents of the judgement we find that there is no merit in this RA. The request made by the applicant cannot be entertained, for the simple reason that he cannot claim a relief by way of an R.A. which relief had not been granted to him in the judgement.

5. That apart, we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record nor has any fresh evidence been discovered which was not available to the applicant at the time of the hearing of the main O.A.

6. For the foregoing reasons this R.A. is rejected by circulation.


(S.P. Biswas)
Member (A)


27.1.99.
(T.N. Bhat)
Member (J)