IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL



NEW DELHI

RA No. 157/90 in OA No.2152/89

O.A. No. T.A. No.

199

DATE OF 1	DECISION 12.11.91
UNION OF INDIA THROUGH CHIEF — ENGINEER, DELHI ZONE, MES, DELHI C	Repetition PETITIONERS.
	Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
Versus	
SHRI YOGENDRA KUMAR	Respondent
	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K.KARTHA, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

The Hon'ble Mr. D.K.CHAKRAVORTY, MEMBER(A)

- 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. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

ORDER

(ORDER OF THE BENCH PASSED BY HON'BLE MR.D.K.CHAKRAVORTY MEMBER(A) IN CIRCULATION)

in this Review Application The Petitioners OA the Respondents 2152 of 1989 in which was disposed of by judgement dated 10.8.90. The grievance of the applicant in OA 2152/89 related to the termination his services by the respondents with effect from After going through the records of the case 8.4.86. the Tribunal held hearing both sides, the services of the applicant of termination was set aside legally sustainable and the same quashed. The respondents in the OA were directed applicant consequential with a11 reinstate the benefits including back wages. They were also directed to consider regularisation of his services by relaxing the upper age-limit for this purpose.

2. The petitioners have not made out any good grounds for review of the judgement. We do not see



any error of law apparent on the face of the judgement. No fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement have been brought out in the petition. In case the petitioners were aggrieved by the decision of the Tribunal, the remedy is by way of appeal to the Supreme Court and not to reagitate the matter by filing a review petition. This petition is, therefore, rejected.

(D.K.CHAKRAVORTY)
MEMBER(A)

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