

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A. NO. 50/1998

in

O.A. NO. 1320/1997

New Delhi this the 13th day of April, 1998.

HON'BLE SHRI N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

1. Prabhakar Singh, EE(E), CPWD
2. A. K. Ahuja, EE(E), CPWD
3. K. V. Singh, EE(E) CPWD
4. S. K. S. Deol, EE(E), CPWD
5. Sarjan Singh, EE(E), CPWD
6. K. K. Jaswal, SE(E), CPWD
7. Nem Chandra, EE(E), CPWD
8. Ratan Lal, EE(E), CPWD
9. Satish Chandra Bhardwaj, EE(E), CPWD

... Review Applicants

IN

K. Srinivasan & Others

-Versus-

Union of India & Others

(in OA 1320/1997)

(By Shri G. K. Aggarwal, Advocate)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Shri N. Sahu, Member (A) :

Heard Shri G. K. Aggarwal, learned counsel for applicants in the review application.

2. By an order of this Court dated 16.10.1997, Shri G. K. Aggarwal was heard and his prayer for impleadment as party respondents was allowed. He states that in the order dated 9.1.1998 passed in OA No. 1320/1997, the names of the respondents mentioned in MA No. 2311/1997 were not printed in the preamble

17

to the order, namely, the memo of parties. This is a clerical mistake. We rectify the same by incorporating the names of the applicants in this review application as respondents (nine of them) in the preamble to the order dated 9.1.1998 passed in OA 1320/1997, along with the names of the four respondents which are already mentioned.

3. The counsel in this review application pleads that one aspect of his arguments, namely, that the guidelines dated 31.1.1997 were inconsistent with the rules, was not discussed in the order. We note that we found that this OA was similar to OA 1716/1990 disposed of by an order dated 3.10.1997 by a Division Bench of this Court in which one of us along with Hon'ble Dr. Jose P. Verghese, the then Vice Chairman (J) was a party. We have followed the order of that Division Bench and the reasons extracted by us from that order along with the reasons mentioned in para 4 of that order would justify the reasons for rejection of the application. We find that there is no error either on fact or on law apparent on the face of record. The argument canvassed before us by the learned counsel in this review application is a matter for fresh adjudication which is not permissible within the short and narrow compass of review. We dismiss this part of the prayer.

18

4. The review application is accordingly disposed of.

A. Kedavalli

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)
Member (J)

/as/

Narasimhaswami

(N. Sahu)
Member (A)