

39

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

Regn.No. RA-142/92 In  
OA-666/88

Date of decision: 6-5-1992

Dr. K.K. Mishra .... Applicant

Versus

Union of India through .... Respondents  
Secy., Miny. of Human  
Resource Development  
and Others

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?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?

JUDGMENT

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

The petitioner in this R.A. is the original applicant in OA-666/88 which was disposed of by judgement dated 16.8.1991. The petitioner, who has worked as Educational Adviser (Sanskrit) in the Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, had challenged in the main application the impugned order dated 1.1.1988 whereby he was discharged from the post

2

of Educational Adviser (Sanskrit). He had also prayed that he should be declared confirmed on the said post after successful completion of the period of one-year probation on the basis of the recommendation made in the Assessment Report given in April, 1987 and forwarded to the U.P.S.C. He had also challenged the extension of his probation on the ground of mala fides and bias of Shri Anil Bordia, Education Secretary.

2. After going through the records of the case and hearing the learned counsel for both the parties, the Tribunal came to the conclusion that the discharge of the petitioner by the impugned order could not be faulted on any legal or constitutional ground. It was, therefore, held that he was not entitled to the relief sought in the main application and the same was dismissed.

3. Thereafter, the petitioner had filed in the Supreme Court S.L.P. (Civil) No.19257/91 against the aforesaid judgement. The Supreme Court dismissed the S.L.P. on 9.1.1992.

4. The present R.A. has been filed by the petitioner on 8.4.1992 along with the application for condonation of delay.

5. We have gone through the grounds raised in the present R.A. as well as the application for condonation

of delay. In our opinion, there is no error of law apparent on the face of the judgement. The petitioner has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement. The petitioner was dissatisfied with the judgement and he had moved the Supreme Court in appeal which was also dismissed by them. The review petition is rejected.

(B.N. Dhomdiyal)  
Administrative Member

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