

(14)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

O.A. No.
T.A. No.

198

DATE OF DECISION 8.2.1990

RA 187/89
in OA 715/86

Sh. Bansi Lal Sharma Applicant (s)

Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus
Union of India & Others Respondent (s)

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. PASGOTRA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. To be circulated to all Benches of the Tribunal ?

JUDGEMENT

(of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri P.K. Kartha,
Vice Chairman(J))

The review petitioner is the original applicant in OA 715/86 which was disposed of by the Tribunal's judgment dated 27.10.1989. In the said OA, the grievance of the applicant was that he was not given a promotion during his period of service while employees similarly situated in the Posts & Telegraph Deptt got the benefit of promotion under a scheme which was adopted by the Government. The Tribunal directed that he should be given the benefit of one-time promotion under the scheme by the respondents in 1983 with effect from 4.7.85 by placing him in the next higher grade of Rs.330-560/- deeming it in the selection grade for the isolated post. In the facts and circumstances of the case,

2

13

it was further held that the applicant would not be entitled to back wages. However, it was further directed that his pension and other retirement benefits should be recomputed in the manner indicated in para 10 of the judgement.

2. After going through the review petition, we see no error of law apparent on the fact of our judgement. The applicant has also not brought to our notice any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement. It may be that the applicant is aggrieved by the decision given by the Tribunal. In such a case, the proper course for him would be to file an appeal in the Supreme Court and not to reagitate the matter by filing a review petition. However, we notice that in paragraphs 8 & 10 of the judgement delivered by us on 27.10.1989 the higher scale of pay for placement of the applicant notionally has been by a typographical error stated as Rs. 330-560/- instead of Rs. 380-560/- (H.S. Gr.I). This typographical error has been corrected by us in the original judgement dated 27.10.1989.

3. Registry to send a copy of the judgement to both the parties as corrected.

4. Subject to the correction indicated in paragraph 2 above, we find the review petition is devoid of any merit and is therefore dismissed with no orders as to the cost.

(I.K. Rasgotra)
Member (A)

8/2/1990

(P.K. Kartha)
Vice-Chairman(J)