

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

22

R.A.119 of 1994 In

O.A. 724 of 1993

Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman(A)

1. Shri P.K. Pattanayak,  
R/o No.336, S/8, R.K. Puram,  
New Delhi.
2. Shri Mohan Singh,  
R/o 285, Sector 12,  
R.K. Puram, New Delhi.
3. Shri O.P. Dutta,  
Asstt. News Editor,  
A.I.R., Parliament Street,  
New Delhi.
4. Shri M.P. Radha Krishnan,  
Asstt. News Editor,  
A.I.R., Parliament Street,  
New Delhi.

Applicants

By Advocate Shri T.C. Aggarwal.

Versus

Union of India through

The Secretary,  
Ministry of Information &  
Broadcasting,  
Shastri Bhavan,  
New Delhi.

Respondent

O R D E R

Hon'ble Shri N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman(A)

The applicants seek a review of my order dated 18.2.1994 in OA-724/93. The claim of the applicants for giving them a higher pay-scale from 1.1.1973 has been rejected by that order.

2

....2...

23

2. The applicants have filed this review application. I am satisfied that it can be disposed of in chamber by circulation and I proceed to do so.

3. I have carefully gone through the review application. The R.A. repeats what has been stated in the O.A. In para.15 of the order, the events leading to the issue of various orders, have been set out. In the R.A., I do not find any error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed out in this regard. That being the foundation of the order, it is clear that it does not suffer from any such error.


4. Likewise, the applicants have not given any information in the review application to show that any F.P.O. or for that matter, any other person junior to them has been regularly appointed to Group III from 1.1.1973 or from any date prior to the date on which they themselves have been appointed.

5. In the circumstances, I do not find any error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed to justify a review.

6. The applicants have pointed a clerical mistake in para.5 and sub-para 3 and 4 of para.15 of the judgement where for the date '01.10.75', the date '1.1.75' has been mentioned. This has been verified. In para.5 of the judgement, there is no such mention. The date '1.1.73' mentioned therein is correct.

24

However, in sub-paras (iii) and (iv) of Para 15 of the judgement, the date '1.1.75' is a clerical mistake and should be corrected to read as '1.10.75'. This correction has been carried out by me in the original record. Corrected versions of sub-paras (iii) and (iv) of Para 15 of the judgement may be supplied by the Registry to the parties. Subject to this direction, the Review Application is dismissed.

  
(N.V. KRISHNAN)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN(A)  
17.6.1994

SLP