

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

R.A.No.90/99 in
O.A.No.590/98

Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 10th day of June, 1999

Shri Cheddi and Others

.. Applicants

Vs.

Union of India & Others.

... Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

The review petitioners/applicants in OA No.590/98 came before the Tribunal with the allegation that though they had been screened for absorption against regular vacancies under Respondent No.3, they had been ignored for appointment under Respondent No.4 on the plea that they were over aged while at the same time their juniors in the screened list had been given preference over them. Holding that the applicants had no right for absorption in vacancies under Respondent No.4 in the capacity of casual employees to be absorbed, the OA was dismissed.

2. In the review petition, the whole case of the applicants made in the in the OA has been extensively repeated and it has been stated that the Tribunal fell into an error as it over looked the important questions of law and fact while deciding the case. It is settled law that a review of a judgment is a serious step and reluctant resort to it is proper only where glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility. A mere repetition of overruled arguments and a second trip over ineffectually covered ground or minor mistake of inconsequential import are obviously insufficient to warrant a review.

Dr

3. The conclusion of the Tribunal that Respondent No.4 could impose conditions as applicable to direct recruits answered all the arguments which had been advanced on behalf of the applicant. I find therefore no ground for review on the basis of various grave error or fact of law patent on the face of the record. The RA is accordingly dismissed.

18


(R.K. Ahooja)
Member(A)

/rao/