

or (12) Sorry -- File does not exist!

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

OA/TA/CCP No. 19

APPLICANT (S)

COUNSEL

VERSUS

RESPONDENT (S)

COUNSEL

Date

Office Report

Orders

13/5/97

RA 102/97 H.S. Verma
in 48
OR 58/96 u.o.

RA Rejected by circulation vide order Dr. B.S.(a)
By DB of Hukile MSL, Swaminathan M.G. &
Rankie MR R.K. Ahuja M.G.

Mr
L.S.

19

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

HON. SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)
HON. SHRI R.K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

R.A. NO.102/1997 (O.A. NO.58/96)

NEW DELHI, THIS 13th DAY OF MAY, 1997.

SHRI H.S. VERMA
S/o Lt. Sh. J.N. Verma
58 Lok Vihar Apartments
Near Oxford Sr. Sec. School
Vikaspuri
NEW DELHI

...Review Applicant

VERSUS

1. Union of India, through

Secretary
Ministry of Communications
Department of Posts
Dak Bhawan, Parl. Street
NEW DELHI

2. Secretary
Dept. of Pers. & Training
North Block
NEW DELHI

3. Director of Accounts (Postal)
Civil Lines
DELHI-54.

4. Secretary
Ministry of Commerce
Udyog Bhawan
NEW DELHI

...RESPONDENTS

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

R.K. AHOOJA, MEMBER (A)

The petitioner in this R.A. seeks a review not of the conclusion reached in the impugned order in O.A. No.58/96 dated 31.3.1997 but of the extent of relief granted. In the impugned order, the applicant was allowed notional stepping up of his pay with reference to that of his junior but the payment of arrears was confined to the date of filing of the

de

..2/-

O.A., i.e., 9.1.1996. The review petitioner has urged that in the facts and circumstances of the case, he was entitled to the payment of arrears w.e.f. 1.2.1989. He has urged that the extent of relief could not be affected as there was no delay on his part in approaching the Tribunal.

2. We have carefully considered the grounds adduced by the review petitioner but find no merit therein. The reasons for limiting the relief in regard to payment of arrears were stated in para 7 of the impugned order. No error of law or fact patent on the face of record has been brought out in the R.A. The petitioner merely reiterates the arguments already advanced before us. A mere repetition of old arguments does not call for a review. In case the petitioner is not satisfied with the conclusion of the Tribunal, it is open to him to seek his remedy before appropriate appellate forum.

3. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed being devoid of merit.

R.K. Adoja
(R.K. ADODJA)
MEMBER (A)

Lakshmi
(SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
MEMBER (J)

/avi/