

-19-

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A.NO.390/2001
IN
O.A.NO.1889/2000

New Delhi, this the 19th day of December, 2001

Hon'ble Shri S.A.T. Rizvi, Member (Admn)

1. Central Pollution Control Board
through its Chairman
Paryavaran Bhawan
East Arjun Nagar
Delhi-32.
2. The Member (Secretary)
Central Pollution Control Board
Paryavaran Bhawan
East Arjun Nagar
Delhi-32.
3. Incharge
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Kanpur
4. Incharge
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Bhopal, M.P.

...Review Applicants

Versus

1. Kunwar Singh, Field Attendant,
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Kanpur
2. Kali Charan
Field Attendant
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Kanpur
3. R.K. Pandey
Attendant,
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Kanpur
4. Prahalad Bhagel
Attendant
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Bhopal
5. Surendra Kumar
Attendant,
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Bhopal

2

-20-

(2)

6. Suresh Kumar
Attendant (Safaiwala)
Central Pollution Control Board
Zonal Office
Bhopal
8. Union of India
through its Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan
CGO Complex, Lodi Road
New Delhi

..Respondents

O R D E R (By circulation)

The present RA-390/2001 seeks to recall/review the order passed by this Tribunal in OA-1889/2000 on 17.10.2001.

2. The aforesaid order, after considering the contentions raised by the parties, provides essentially two reliefs to the applicants in the OA. The first is with regard to applicants' entitlement to receive payments after taking into account the basic pay, DA etc. as applicable to regular employees working in similar capacities following the principles of equal pay for equal work. The other relief provides age relaxation and a direction to the respondents to consider the applications, if any, filed by the applicants in respect of vacancies likely to arise in future in accordance with the Regulations of 1995. In other words, barring age relaxation, no other concession has been extended to the applicants insofar as recruitment to the post of Attendant is concerned. That is to say, practically for all purposes, the Regulations of 1995 will have to be adhered to. I do not find any mistake on the face of record in the orders thus passed by this Tribunal.

3. While there is no mistake apparent on the face of the record, I also do not find any justification for

2

(3)

entertaining the present RA in the light of the provisions made in Order XLVII Rule 1 of the CPC read with Section 22 (3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

4. For the reasons aforesated, the RA is rejected.


(S.A.T. Rizvi)
Member (A)

/sunil/