

22

R.A.M. 6/99 -
1878/97

22²/₉₉

R.A. has been rejected
by a DB of Honble the Chairman
+ Honble Sh. K. Muthukumar, (RCA)
on 22/2/99.

BD
PML-ing
Col/C I
22/2/99

(23)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A. No. 6 of 1999 In
O.A. No. 1878 of 1997

New Delhi this the 22nd day of February, 1999

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.M. AGARWAL, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE MR. K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER (A)

1. Anurag Kulshreshtha
S/o H.S. Kulshreshtha,
Station Engineer,
Doordarshan Maintenance Centre,
Pilani (Rajasthan).
2. Sunil
S/o Shiv Saran Srivastava,
Deputy Director (E),
AIR & Doordarshan,
Jamnagar House,
New Delhi.
3. K. Subramanian
S/o Shri Krishnan
Deputy Director (E),
AIR & Doordarshan,
Jamnagar House,
New Delhi.
4. N. Thiyagarajan,
S/o Shri Navneethak Krishnan,
Station Engineer,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Indiranagar,
Pondicherry-605006. ..Review Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through
Secretary,
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting,
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 001.
2. The Director General,
All India Radio (AIR),
Akashvani Bhawan,
Parliament Street,
New Delhi. ..Respondents

ORDER BY CIRCULATION

This Review Application seeks a review of our order passed in OA No. 1878 of 1997. The operative para of our order reads as follows:-

W



4. Accordingly, as desired by the learned counsel for the parties, we dispose of this O.A. with the direction that the applicants will, with reference to the date of completion of their probation be allowed the same benefits as were granted to the applicants in OA 337/92. However, the present applicants will not be entitled to any arrears of pay till the date of filing of their application i.e. 6.8.97. The respondents will comply with these directions within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs."

In the present Review Application, the applicants have reargued their case for the grant of arrears. As may be seen from the operative para of the order, the applicants were allowed the same benefits as were granted to the applicants in OA 337/92 with a stipulation that they will not be entitled to any arrears till the date of filing of the application as was decided in a similar other matter in OA 1886/97. The applicants seek to reagitate the issue of arrears. We do not find any error or omission on the face of the record in our order. If the applicants do not agree with our order in regard to the question of arrears, the remedy does not lie in a review application. As there is no error or omission on the face of the record, there is no case for review of the order in terms of Order 47 Rule 1 of the CPC.

In view of the above, the RA is rejected.


(K.M. AGARWAL)
CHAIRMAN


(K. MUTHUKUMAR)
MEMBER (A)

Rakesh