

Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench

Review Application No.131 of 2001
(in O.A.No.1033/2000)

28

New Delhi, this the 1st day of May, 2001

Dr.S.R.Singh

-Review-Applicant
(Respondent No.6 in O.A.)

Versus

1. Union of India through its Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block,
New Delhi.
2. CBI through its Director, Block-3, CGO
Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
3. Central Forensic Science Laboratory
through its Director, Block-4, CGO
Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
4. UPSC through its Secretary, Dholpur
House, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
5. The Secretary, DOPT, North Block, New
Delhi.
6. Shri T.R.Nehra, Principal Scientific:
Officer, Central Forensic Science:
Laboratory, CBI, Block-4, CGO Complex, :
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003. : (both
: applicants
7. Dr.S.C.Mittal Principal Scientific: in O.A.)
Officer, Central Forensic Science:
Laboratory, CBI, Block-4, CGO Complex, :
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003. - Respondents

O R D E R (in Circulation)

By V.K.Majotra, Member(Admnv) -

By this review application, the review-applicant, who was a private-respondent in O.A. 1033/2000, has sought review of order dated 31.1.2001 passed in aforesaid OA by stating that he was promoted as a Principal Scientific Officer on in situ basis in the year 1991 against the panel of 1987 and on a regular basis in the year 1992 i.e. before the applicants in OA 1033/2000 became eligible for consideration. Applicants in OA 1033/2000 Shri T.R.Nehra and Dr.S.C.Mittal (private respondents 6 and 7, in the present RA) were selected by a DPC convened on 30.10.1995 against the panel of 1990. Therefore, he remains senior to private

respondents 6 & 7, even though the said O.A. has been allowed.

2. The review applicant (private respondent 6 in OA 1033/2000) had adopted the counter-affidavit filed by the official respondents in the OA and his counsel Shri V.S.R.Krishna was heard at length in the OA along with Shri K.C.D.Gangwani, learned counsel of the official respondents in the O.A. and the O.A. was decided on merit vide order dated 31.1.2001.

3. The present review-application is merely an attempt to reargue the entire matter which is outside the scope and ambit of a review application. If the review-applicant becomes aggrieved by the action of the respondents in compliance of order of the Tribunal dated 31.1.2001, the remedy does not lie through the present review-application. The present review application is, therefore, rejected at the circulation stage itself.

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

rkv

V.K. Majotra

(V.K. Majotra)
Member (Admnv)