

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**



**R.A. No.200/2019
in
OA No.198/2014**

This the 22th day of January, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J)
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Union of India & Others: through

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Defence
South Block, New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Office of JS (Trg) & CAO
Ministry of Defence, E Block Hutmants
New Delhi – 110 011.
3. The Secretary
DOP&T, North Block, New Delhi.
4. The Secretary
Department of Expenditure, Ministry of
Finance
North Block, New Delhi.
Applicants

(through Shri Padma Kumar S. Advocate)

Versus

Shri Ajay Goel
Flat No.310, Suraksha Sadan
Co-Op Group Housing Society
Plot No.13
Sector -9, Dwarka Phase-I,
New Delhi – 110 077.
Respondents

(through Anil Kumar Singh)

ORDER (Oral)**Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (A):**

By way of present Review Application, the applicant has sought review of the Order/judgment dated 16.04.2019 in the aforesaid OA. The said Order/Judgment of this Tribunal reads as under:

"When this matter taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the applicant, while producing an order of a Coordinate Bench of this Tribunal in O.A. No.4276/2013 dated 04.12.2018 in Hari Prem Malik and Others vs. Union of India and Others, submitted that the applicant is identically placed like the applicants in the said O.A., as the impugned order in both the O.As. is one and the same and, accordingly, prays that the instant O.A. may also be disposed of in terms of the judgment in the said O.A.

2. Shri A.K. Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondents, not disputed the said fact.

3. In the circumstances and for the aforesaid reasons, the instant O.A. is disposed of, in terms of the judgment in O.A. No.4276/2013 dated 04.12.2018 in Hari Prem Malik and Others vs. Union of India and Others. No costs."

2. From the aforesaid, it is evident that the entire claim of the applicant was that the claim of the applicant is identically placed persons as the applicants in OA No.4276/2013 which has been allowed vide Order/Judgment dated 04.12.2018 and, therefore, the claim of the applicant in the present OA should also be disposed of in terms of the said Order/Judgment dated 04.12.2018. This fact has not been disputed by the learned counsel for the



respondents. In the aforesaid circumstances, the aforesaid OA was disposed of in terms of the Order/Judgment dated 04.12.2018.

3. Shri Padma Kumar S., learned counsel for the review respondent in the present RA submits that the review applicants have preferred identical Review Application in OA No.4276/2013 also and the said Review Application was dismissed. This fact is accepted by Shri A.K. Singh, learned counsel for the review applicants (respondent in OA). However, he submits that the dismissal of the said RA was passed under circulation.

4. We are of the considered view that once Review Application in OA No.4276/2013 was dismissed, it is immaterial whether the same was dismissed in circulation or in open Court.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we do not find any error apparent in the Order/Judgment sought to be reviewed in the present RA. Accordingly, the present RA is dismissed.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(R. N. Singh)
Member (J)

ravi/jugal/uma