

28

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

Regn.No. RA 189/1989 in
OA 1385 of 1988

a.

Date of decision: 8-11-91

Dr. Vinod Kumar Ramteke

...Applicant/
Petitioner in RA

Vs.

Union of India & Others

...Respondents

For the Petitioner

...None

For the Respondents

...None

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. P.K. KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

THE HON'BLE MR. P.C. JAIN, 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 Mr. P.K. Kartha
Vice Chairman(J))

The petitioner in this RA is the original applicant in OA 1385 of 1988 which was disposed of by judgment dated 20.10.1989. He had prayed for the following reliefs:-

- (i) To direct the respondents to confirm him in the grade of Assistant Professor as on 23.6.1983 when he completed his 2 years probation period as also when a clear vacancy was available.
 - (ii) To direct the respondents to revise the seniority of Assistant Professors as on 1.11.1985 showing him as senior to those who were not confirmed before 15.10.1984 in the post of Assistant Professor and review the promotion panel issued by them as on 6.11.1985 and appoint him to the post of Associate Professor with effect from that date.
- 2

28

(iii) To direct the respondents to pay him arrears of pay and allowances due to him on account of promotion to the post of Associate Professor with effect from 13.9.1985 and also to recast his seniority in the post of Associate Professor showing his seniority with effect from 13.9.1985.

(iv) To direct the respondents to consider him to the post of Professor on his attaining the eligibility to be considered for the same on the basis of his holding the post of Associate Professor with effect from 13.9.1985.

2. After going through the records of the case carefully and hearing both sides, the Tribunal held that the petitioner was not entitled to any of the reliefs as prayed for in the application. We see no error apparent on the face of the judgment. The petitioner has also not brought out any new facts warranting a review of the judgment. The RA is accordingly rejected.

Cecilia
(P.C. JAIN) 11/91
MEMBER (A)

Quint
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)