

15

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH : DELHI

R.A. NO. 187/90
IN O.A. NO. 751/88

Date of decision 4.1.91

Brij Lal Bharti ... Review Applicant

Shri B. S. Mainee ... Counsel for the
Review Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Ors ... Respondents

Shri Inderjit Sharma ... Counsel for the
Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI F. C. JAIN, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE SHRI J. P. SHARMA, MEMBER (J)

O R D E R

Hon'ble Shri J. P. Sharma, Member (J) :

The present Review Application has been moved under Section 22 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunals (Procedure) Rules, 1987 against the judgment dated 31.10.90.

2. In the judgment a direction was issued while disposing of the original application in para 15 mainly asking the respondents that the annual report for the year 1986-87 be got recorded by the reporting officer who had actually seen the work of the applicant while working as Senior Traction Power Controller, Northern Railway, Tundla and the prayer of the applicant that the annual report given by Shri Narottam Das, D.E.E. be allowed to be honoured by the respondents was disallowed.

3. In this Review Application a direction is sought against the respondents, after reviewing the aforesaid judgment, that the report of Shri Narottam Das, D.E.E. for the year 1986-87 be honoured as the applicant had actually worked under Shri Narottam Das, D.E.E. (TRD), Tundla for more than three months.

Le

4. We have gone through the judgment and facts of the case. The matter has been fully dealt with in para 10 of the judgment and in fact the applicant himself had requested the respondents that he should be given Part-I of the C.R. submitted earlier so that he may fill up the Part-I of the C.R. form on the same lines on which he had done earlier to make the same available to the reporting officer for giving the report in Part-II of the form. The learned counsel for the applicant has filed Annexures Y and Z to show that Shri Narottam Das actually worked at Tundla in the year 1986-87 and was transferred in the month of July, 1986 to Kanpur. As such, Shri Narottam Das, D.E.E. (TRD) had the occasion and opportunity to watch the work of the applicant and so his report be honoured which was given in the Part-I of the C.R. form by him.

5. We have considered this aspect in the light of the pleadings of the parties and the representation made by the applicant to the authorities at the time when he was ^{not} promoted in his turn and was passed over. In the light of that, the necessary direction was issued and now there is no *prima facie* error apparent on the face of the judgment nor any material piece of evidence has been escaped over. In fact, the applicant has to only submit the Part-I of the C.R. form for the year 1986-87 on which the reporting officer who had seen the work of the applicant during the whole period of report shall give the report in Part-II of the C.R. form and that is the direction issued in para 15 of the judgment. We do not find any ground to review the order.

6. In view of the above, the Review Application is without merit and is dismissed accordingly.

J. P. SHARMA

(J. P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)

C. C. JAIN

(P. C. JAIN)
MEMBER (A)