

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH NEW DELHI

R.A. No. 214/2001 in OA 416/1997

NEW DELHI THIS 11TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2002

HON'BLE SHRI GOVINDAN S. TAMPI, MEMBER (A)

Union of India & Others : Review Applicant.

VERSUS

Sh. Radha Kishan Prasad & Ors.....Respondents.

O R D E R

R.A. No. 214/2002 has been filed seeking recall and review of my order dated 2.4.2002 disposing of OA No. 416/1997 .

2. MA No. 1996/2002 for condonation of delay is allowed in the interest of justice.

3. I have considered the matter. OA No. 416/97 had been filed by 55 applicants alleging that their services had not been re-engaged as Casual Labourer while a number of their juniors had been given the said benefits. The OA was disposed of by order in the open court after hearing both the learned counsel and perusing the points raised in the OA. Sh. P S Mahendru ^{learned Counsel for the respondents} had indicated that the respondents would be prepared to consider the case of the applicants also if any one other than 36 persons mentioned by them as having been re-engaged on the basis of Tribunal's order in OA No. 2939/92 and junior to the any of the applicants, has been re-engaged in preference to the applicants. The OA was disposed of accordingly directing the respondents to consider the case of the applicants if any one junior to them other than 36 persons mentioned has been re-engaged and continues to work. The applicants were also directed to furnish to the respondents the case of such junior (s) ^{if any} who have been so re-engaged whereafter the respondents after examination were

-2-

to re-engage them as promised. This order does not have any error on the face of the record, and has been disposed in the light of the averment made by the learned counsel for the respondent on the bar of the Court. The Review Applicant is now trying to reargue the case on the alleged ground of error which has not been brought out. This does not fall within the scope of review in terms of Rule 22(3) (f) of the CAT (Procedure) Rules 1985.

4. RA being devoid of any merit fails and accordingly rejected.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

Patwal/