



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

R.A. No. 70/2020

In

OA No. 1113/2020

Today this the 26th day of October, 2020

Through video conferencing

**Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. R. N. Singh, Member (J)**

Smt Usha Rani, (Senior Citizen)
W/o Sh. Jasvant Singh, Aged about 60 years,
Designation- Superannuated as Part Time Vocational
Fashion Technology Teacher (Group-B) at SKV,
Sultanpuri, C Block,
Delhi-110041

... Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr Varun Mudgil)

Versus

1. GNCT of Delhi, Through its Chief Secretary,
Delhi Secretariat, IP Estate,
New Delhi-110002
2. Director, Directorate of Education,
GNCT of Delhi, Old Secretariat Building,
New Delhi-110054
3. Dy. Director of Education (Vocational),
Directorate of Education, GNCT of Delhi
Plot No. 3, 2nd Floor, Science Centre-3 Building Link
Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005

.. Respondents

(By Advocate: Ms Esha Mazumdar)



ORDER (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A):

The applicant herein was working as Part Time Vocational Fashion Technology Teacher. Her services were disengaged on attaining the age of 60 years. She approached the Tribunal in this OA seeking retiral benefits including pension and re-employment.

2. When the matter was being heard, the applicant sought to withdraw the OA. It was dismissed as withdrawn vide Order dated 21.08.2020. Thereafter, the applicant approached the Hon'ble Court of Delhi for similar relief in WP (C) No.5920/2019. While the matter was argued in Hon'ble High Court, counsel for the respondents took a plea that the OA was withdrawn by applicant without taking any liberty whatsoever.

This Writ was accordingly disposed of on 02.09.2020 as withdrawn.

3. The applicant has now preferred RA No.70/2020 seeking revision to the directions of the Tribunal dated 21.08.2020 that instead of 'dismissed as withdrawn', the order may be modified to 'dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file a better OA'.



4. Matter has been heard at length. Shri Varun Mudgil, learned counsel represented the applicant. Ms Esha Mazumdar, learned counsel represented the respondents.

5. The review application is allowed only if there is any error apparent on the face of record. In the instant case, the counsel for the review applicant, had sought withdrawal of the OA without seeking any liberty etc. Accordingly, the same was dismissed as withdrawn.

6. Further, there is not even a whisper in the present Review Application that there was a prayer on the behalf of the applicant, to grant any liberty to the applicant. In the instant case, the applicant had approached Hon'ble High Court for seeking the similar relief.

7. We do find any error apparent in the order as passed.

8. Accordingly, we do not find any merit in the RA and the same is dismissed. No costs.

(R. N. Singh)
Member (J)

(Pradeep Kumar)
Member (A)