

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

(2)

o o o o

R.A. NO. 316/94

in

O.A. 186/94

New Delhi, this the ^{23rd} ~~22nd~~ September, 1994

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri B.K. Singh, Member (A)

Shri Kawal Krishan Attri,
s/o Shri Shankar Dass,
Dy. Shop Superintendent,
Northern Railway Signal Shop,
Ghaziabad,

R/o 340-B Railway Road,
Opp. Railway Hospital,
Ghaziabad.

o o o o Applicant

(By Advocate Shri M.L. Sharma)

vs.

1. Union of India through
General Manager,
Northern Railway
Headquarters Office,
Baroda House,
New Delhi.
2. Chief Personnel Officer,
Northern Railway,
Headquarters Office,
Baroda House,
New Delhi.
3. Chief Works Manager,
Northern Railway,
Signal Shop,
Ghaziabad.
4. Shri Amrik Singh,
Deputy Shop Superintendent,
(under Order of Promotion as S.S.)
through Chief Works Manager,
N. Railway, Signal Shop
Ghaziabad.

o o o Respondents

(By Advocate: R. Dooraishwamy with
Shri Sant Lal, for Respondent No.4)

o o o 2.



ORDER

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member(J)

The Respondent No.4 Shri Amrik Singh has filed this Review Petition against the judgement dated 5.8.84. The original applicant Shri Kaval Krishan Attri was granted the relief for considering his case for promotion to the post of Shop Superintendent from 21.8.93 with all consequential benefits. The impugned order of promotion of Amrik Singh, Respondent No.4 dated 20.1.94 was quashed.

2. Shri Amrik Singh, Respondent No.4 has filed this Review Petition on the grounds that a general candidate was promoted at Point No.8 because of non availability of reserve category candidate when the vacancy arose in the year 1989-90. Respondent No.4 was ordered to be reverted by the order dated 10.3.89 as he has failed in the selection. He was placed in the panel of Deputy Shop Superintendent u.e.f. 1.3.93 on the basis of modified procedure of selection on account of restructuring introduced by the Railways u.e.f. 1.3.93 he was not eligible for the post of Shop Superintendent. Point No.¹²~~10~~ is unreserved point and the original applicant was entitled to be promoted having passed the selection. Thus, there is no error apparent on the face of the order.

④
23

3. Grounds B and C of the Review Petition that the original applicant has staked for being promoted to the post of Shop Superintendent and the vacancy fell in the year 1989-90 against Point No.8 cannot be visualised in view of 40% communal roster record maintained by the respondents.

4. The Review Application does not show any ground for reviewing the judgement. The Review Application is therefore dismissed. (By Circularly)


(B.K. SINGH)
MEMBER (A)


(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)

'rk'