

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

RA-168/89 Im.

O.A. No. 1457/88

198

T.A. No.

DATE OF DECISION 12-2-1990

Shri Prem Chand

Applicant (s)

None

Advocate for the Applicant (s)

Versus

Central Water Commission
& Others

Respondent (s)

None

Advocat for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

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

The Hon'ble Mr.

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

(delivered by Hon'ble Shri P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman)

The original applicant in OA-1467/88 has filed this petition praying for review of the judgement dated 29.9.1989 and for quashing the orders of transfer of the petitioner dated 23.6.1988 and 28.4.1988. The petitioner has also filed an application praying for ~~setting~~ ^{staying} the operation of the judgement dated 29.9.1989.

2. By judgement dated 29.9.1989, the Tribunal had held that the impugned orders dated 28.4.1988 and 23.6.1988 cannot be faulted on any ground. The petitioner has stated that the Tribunal did not take into account all the facts and circumstances mentioned by him in his

....2....

12
application. According to him, the points which have not been taken into account by the Tribunal are that he has already attained the age of 53 years and as per the transfer policy, he cannot be transferred, that the wife of the petitioner is employed at Delhi, and that the petitioner is a heart patient.

3. The above points have been duly considered by the Tribunal before passing the judgement dated 29.9.1989. The petitioner has not brought out any new facts warranting a review of the judgement. He has also not indicated any error of law apparent on the face of the record. In case the petitioner is dissatisfied with the decision of the Tribunal, the proper course for him would be to file a Special Leave Petition in the Supreme Court and not to re-agitate the matter through a review petition. There is no merit in the present petition and the same is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.


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