

40
(8)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

RA No.83/1991 in
Regn.No.OA 764/1988

Date of decision: 31.07.1992

Shri N.C. Barman

...Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India & Others

...Respondents

For the Petitioner

...Shri T.C. Aggarwal,
Counsel

For the Respondents

...Shri P.H. Ramchandani
Sr. Counsel

CORAM:

The Hon'ble Mr.P.K. Kartha, Vice Chairman(J)

The Hon'ble Mr.B.N. Dhoundiyal, Administrative Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed
to see the Judgment? *Yes*

2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? *No*

JUDGMENT

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

Association Engineering Staff (E) representing Junior
Engineers/Assistant Engineers of the Civil Construction Wing,
All India Radio, New Delhi, had filed OA 764/88 in the Principal
Bench of the Tribunal and the same was disposed of by judgment
dated 8.3.1991. The grievance of the petitioner Association
related to the recruitment rules notified on 28.3.1988 whereby
the Diploma Holder Junior Engineers had been placed at a
disadvantage in the matter of promotion to the posts of Assistant

2

ul ⑨

Engineer and Executive Engineer. After going through the records of the case carefully and hearing the learned counsel of both parties, the Tribunal found no merit in the application and the same was dismissed.

2. The present RA has been filed by Shri N.C. Barman wherein he has stated that he has filed OA No.1078 of 1989 (N.C. Barman alias Narayan Chandra Barman and Others Vs. Union of India and Others) in the Calcutta Bench of the Tribunal wherein the recruitment rules notified in 1988 have been challenged. After hearing the learned counsel for the review applicant on 23.04.1991, the Tribunal passed an ex-parte interim order directing the respondents not to act upon the judgment of the Tribunal dated 8.3.1991. The said interim order was, however, modified on 19.09.1991 to the effect that any promotion/appointment will be subject to the outcome of the review application.

3. We have gone through the records of the case carefully and have heard the learned counsel for both parties. We have also duly considered the written submission dated 8.7.1992 filed by the review applicant. We do not see any error of law apparent on the face of the judgment dated 8.3.1991. The review applicant has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the

Q

42
(10)

judgment. The review application is accordingly rejected.

The interim orders passed in the RA are hereby vacated.

B.N. Dhoundiyal
(B.N. DHOUNDIYAL) 31/7/92
MEMBER (A)
31.07.1992

P.K. Kartha
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)
31.07.1992

RKS
310792