

(18)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.  
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

R.A.No.174/94  
in O.A.No.2222/93

New Delhi, this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of May, 1994.

HON'BLE SHRI P.T.THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER(A)

Shri Surjit Singh MES No.312905  
s/o Late Shri Sardar Jaswant Singh  
R/O 187 B, Pocket J&K  
Dilshad Garden Delhi-  
Working as Draftsman Grade II  
G.E.(R&D), Lucknow Road, Delhi.  
(By Shri KBS Rajan, Advocate)

..Applicant

Vs.

1. Union of India: through  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
South Block, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Engineer (Delhi Zone)  
Delhi Cantt, Delhi.
3. The Chief Engineer,  
Western Command, Chandimandir.
4. Garrison Engineer (R&D)  
Lucknow Road, Delhi 110054.

.. Respondents

(By circulation)  
ORDER

HON'BLE SHRI P.T.THIRUVENGADAM, Member(A).

This Review Application has been filed  
against the orders passed in O.A.No.2222/93 on 25-3-94.

2. The only ground advanced in support of the R.A. is that in the case of one Shri S.Chander Chatrath SK-1 the transfer order was changed to the advantage in of the party. It is alleged that in the case of Shri S.Chander Chatrath who was transferred by the order No.30301/Jan 93/E/C dated 15-10-93, a modification was issued on 22-2-1994 by keeping the party in a local station. The consideration shown to this person has been based on the same grounds as advanced by the applicant when he had sought cancellation of the transfer order. It is mentioned that this additional

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.  
material could not be procured despite affording

<https://PDFReplacer.com>

full diligence by the applicant at the time of filing

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.  
the O.A. and the facts of case relating to Shri  
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

5. Chandra Chathrath have come to applicant's notice  
only after the O.A. in this case had been disposed  
of.

2. The applicant while filing the application  
had mentioned two other cases namely those of Shri  
Balram Dogra and Shri Ram Pal Singh in para 4.11  
of the application. It was his case that the posting  
orders of these two similarly situated employees  
had been cancelled. In the L affidavit filed by  
the respondents in reply to para 4.11 it was mentioned  
that the cancellation of posting in the said cases  
was made based on merit of cases at appropriate level.  
In the order passed in this O.A. the issue relating  
to these two employees alongwith the remarks of the  
respondents was discussed.

3. It is difficult to accept the additional  
further material with regard to the alleged  
discriminatory transfer at the stage when review  
application has been filed. The applicant should  
have taken due care in filing the O.A. and included in  
it whatever material he thought was relevant. Even  
otherwise keeping in view the remarks of the  
respondents with regard to the two cases already  
cited, I do not find any reason to allow the Review  
Application on the only ground of alleged discrimination.

4. As per order 47 in C.P.C the scope of the  
review is very limited. The R.A. cannot be made use  
of as an opportunity to file an appeal. In the circumstances  
the R.A. is dismissed.

'MALIK'

P. J. Thiruvengadam  
Member (A).

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.  
<https://PDFReplacer.com>