

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH. (9)

R.A. NO. 112/94

in

O.A. NO. 171/94

New Delhi this the 26th day of July, 1994.

Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice Chairman (A).

Shri B.S. Hegde, Member(J).

Hardev Singh Nanda,
S/o Shri Sardar Singh Nanda,
R/o 82/5, Pushp Vihar,
New Delhi.

...Applicant.

By Advocate Shri B.L. Babbar.

Versus

1. The Union of India through
Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
Department of Defence Production,
South Block,
New Delhi.
2. Director General Quality Assurance,
Department of Defence Production,
South Block,
New Delhi.
3. The Senior Quality Assurance Officer,
SQAE (Armament), T/18, Kandhar Lines,
Delhi Cantt. ...Respondents.

ORDER

Shri N.V. Krishnan.

The applicant seeks a review of the order dated 10.2.1994 dismissing the O.A. 171/94. We have seen the review application. In our view this case can be disposed of by circulation and we proceed to do so.


2. In the O.A. a direction was sought to quash the order transferring the applicant from the cash section to the finance section. On our direction, he produced the Department of Defence Production, Directorate General of Inspection Group 'C' (Non-technical posts) Recruitment Rules, 1983 as the rules were relevant to substantiate the point that the appointment to the cash section is a promotion


for a UDC. It is after considering these rules that the O.A. was dismissed.

3. The applicant has now produced the Research and Development Organisation (Ministry of Defence) Class-III Non-Gazetted Ministerial posts recruitment rules, 1968 to contend that there is an error apparent on the face of record in our original order.

4. We do not find any merit in this contention. Firstly, it was the applicant himself who relied on the 1983 rules, referred to above, in support of his case. Secondly, it is seen that the applicant is employed under the Directorate General of Inspection of the Department of Defence Production. Therefore, the 1983 rules referred to above were appropriate. The 1968 Rules now produced in the R.A. apply to the Research and Development Organisation, which, on the face of it, appears to be totally unconnected with the applicant.

5. In the circumstance, we do not find that there is any error apparent on the face of record, to require review of the order. The R.A. is dismissed.


(B.S. Hegde)
Member(J)


26/7/84
(N.V. Krishnan)
Vice Chairman(A)