

three
four

1-8

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. 114 of 1994

April 5, 1994.

in

O.A. No. 1220/1994

Shri R.C. MISHRA

....

Applicant.

Vs.

Union of India & Ors.

....

Respondents.

(By circulation)

O R D E R

The applicant has sought review of my order made in O.A. No. 1220/1994 on 10th February, 1994. He has tried to argue the same contentions which have been considered and rejected in the judgment. The applicant does not depend on discovery of any new and important material which he was not able to secure and produce in spite of due diligence when the Original Application was heard and disposed of. The applicant has not been able to show that there is any error apparent on the face of the record. One of the contentions raised is that there is an error apparent on the face of the record in regard to the finding recorded in the judgment that the post of Law Assistant was advertised and appointment was made after due selection. It is further held that the applicant not having applied for the said post cannot make any grievance. He has contended that there is no material to support this finding. It is enough to advert to paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13 in the counter affidavit where these facts have been clearly stated, which have been accepted. The applicant having not placed any material to disbelieve the same, ~~hence~~ there is no good ground to review the order. This

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>

V. S. Malimath
(V.S. MALIMATH)
CHAIRMAN