

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

R.A. 45/93 in  
O.A. 2531/1988

Date of decision :10.03.93

Shri Hari Prasad Banodha

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through the  
Dte of Agriculture & Cooperation  
Dte of Economics & Statistics  
Ministry of Agriculture

... Respondents

CORAM :-

The Hon'ble Mr I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

O R D E R

Petitioner Shri Hari Prasad Banodha, has filed this Review Application on 11th Feb., 1993 seeking review of the judgement rendered on 6.1.1993 in O.A. No. 2531/89. The principal grounds adduced for seeking review are :-

(a) that the petitioner was appointed as computer and promoted as technical clerk on the recommendations of Departmental Promotion Committee. He was not appointed Computer on the recommendation of the D.P.C., as stated in the judgement.

(b) On page-2 para 2 the judgement refers to Department of Personnel O.M.S dated 30.2.1983 and 30.9.1983 which relates to

l  
B

promotion on ad hoc basis. This reference is irrelevant as the petitioner was promoted substantively as Technical clerk w.e.f.

25.2.1982.

Therefore, portion of the judgement from line 6 at page 2 and starting from the words 'petitioner belongs to S.C. community' till the end of the paragraph be deleted.

2. As far as the first ground<sup>for</sup> review is concerned only ~~syntax~~ needs to be corrected, as the first two sentences have been combined by a typographical error. The first two sentences of paragraph 2 should read as under :-

"The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as Computer in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics. On the recommendation of Departmental Promotion Committee (D.P.C.), the petitioner was appointed as Technical clerk vide order dated 28.6.1989."

The Registry is directed to set right the first two sentences appearing in paragraph 2 as above.

As regards the reference to the O.M. of Department of Personnel dated 30.2.1983 and 30.9.1983 no change is required as the pleadings of the petitioner

*DW*

and the reply filed by the respondents clearly indicate. There is no other mistake or error apparent on the face of record or any other ground for review of the judgement which is covered by the Statutory exceptions made in Order LXVII of C.P.C. The review petition is disposed of as above.

*I.K. Rasgotra*  
(I.K. RASGOTRA)  
MEMBER (A)

sss