

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA No. 101/99 IN
OA No. 1166/98

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

HON'BLE SHRI R.K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

In the matter of:

Shri Vinod Kumar
S/o Late Shri Prithvi Raj
R/o D-10, Chankyapuri Fire Station,
New Delhi.

.... Review Applicant

Vs.

1. Delhi Fire Service
Headquarters Connaught Circus
New Delhi-110001
through its Chief Fire Officer.
2. Govt. of National Capital Territory of Delhi
5, Sham Nath Marg,
Delhi-110054 (through its Chief Secretary).
3. The Deputy Secretary (Home III)
Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi
5, Sham Nath Marg, Delhi. Respondents


O R D E R (By Circulation)

The applicant/review petitioner has come before the Tribunal seeking a direction to the respondents to allot him a Type-II quarter due to the large number of his family members. It was submitted that he had obtained appointment on compassionate ground as LDC under the Delhi Fire Service and a Type-I quarter earlier allotted to his deceased father had been regularised in the applicant's name. It was applicant's case that even though he was entitled for a Type-II quarter and some other LDCs also appointed on compassionate grounds have been given Type-II quarters, the said benefit has been refused in his case. Holding that the applicant could not claim any further benefit on compassionate ground after obtaining initial appointment on that basis, the OA was summarily dismissed.

Ne

2. The review petitioner/applicant has now sought a review of the order of this Tribunal on the ground that ~~this~~ Tribunal failed to take into consideration the specific pleadings of the parties contained in the main application, the counter reply, the rejoinder as well as the documents annexed. In other words, the main ground is that the Tribunal has not drawn the correct conclusions from the facts and case law submitted before it. This cannot be a ground for review since review jurisdiction is to be exercised only where a patent mistake or like grave error has crept ^{into} ~~with~~ the order by judicial fallibility. No such error of fact of law has been pointed out by the petitioner. If the applicant is not satisfied with the conclusion of the Tribunal his remedy lies elsewhere.

3. The RA is accordingly summarily dismissed.


(R.K. AHOOJA)
Member (A)

"sd"