

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI**

**1) RA No. 137/2003**

**IN  
OA No.1620/2000  
With  
MA No.1013/2003**

**AND**

**2) RA NO.141/2003**

**IN  
OA No.1644/2000  
MA No.1034/2003**

**New Delhi: this the 8<sup>th</sup> day of July,2005**

**HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.S.AGGARWAL, CHAIRMAN  
HON'BLE MR. S.K.NAIK, MEMBER(A)**

**1) RA No.137/2003**

Shri Surinder Singh,  
S/o Shri Kapoor Singh,  
Electrician,  
Elec. Division No.2,  
CPWD, Firozshah Road Enq. Office,  
New Delhi

Original Applicant/  
Review Respondent

**VERSUS**

Union of India & Others

Original Respondents/  
Review Applicants

**2) RA No.141/2003**

Shri Ram Kumar,  
S/o Shri Laakshman Singh,  
R/o 211/26,  
Tine Nalka Wali Gali,  
Arya Nagar,  
Sonepat (Haryana)

Original Applicant/  
Review Respondent.

**VERSUS**

Union of India, through

1. Central Public Works Department  
Through its Director General Works,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi.
2. The Office of Superintending Engineer,  
(Electrical)  
Coordination Circle, (Elect), CPWD,  
Room No.401A, IVth Floor, ID Bhawan,

New Delhi-2

Original Respondents/  
Review Applicants

Advocates in both RAs: Shri G.D.Bhandari for the original applicants/review Respondents.

Shri D.S. Mahendru for the original respondents/review applicants.

**ORDER**

**HON'BLE MR. S.K.NAIK, MEMBER(A):**

Respondents in OA No.1620/2000, which was decided on 14.1.2003, have filed this review application contending that while the Tribunal rightly noted the details of vacancies as were available under direct quota and promotion quota respectively, in para 3 of the order, it misinterpreted the surplus of three General category direct quota employees to be available as vacancies against the direct quota. Counsel for the review applicants has contended that counting of the surplus employees towards the available vacancies is a mistake apparent on the face of record appears to have crept in due to an oversight. However, this has changed the entire complexion of the case and, therefore, he has urged that the order be recalled.

2. Counsel for the original applicants, now respondents, has objected to the review applications on the ground that the RAs have become infructuous with the passage of time.
3. We have perused the record of the case.
4. Earlier the original applicants, now respondents, had filed RA No.55/2003 seeking review of the order dated 14.1.2003. The review application had been dismissed by the Tribunal on the ground that "the said order was passed with the consent of the parties." A second review is not permissible in law. However, since the discrepancy on the basis of arithmetical representation is apparent, the review applicants may take note thereof for further action. The RAs are disposed of in these terms.

(S.K.NAIK)  
MEMBER (A)

(V.S.AGGARWAL)  
CHAIRMAN