

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

R.A. 127/89

O.A. No. 974

T.A. No.

198 9.

DATE OF DECISION 28.9.89.

Shri P.L.Premi \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant (s)  
Shri Karan Singh

Shri B.B.Srivastava, \_\_\_\_\_ Advocate for the Applicant (s)  
Versus  
Union of India \_\_\_\_\_ Respondent (s)

Shri P.P.Khurana, \_\_\_\_\_ Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM :

The Hon'ble Mr. P.Srinivasan, Administrative Member.

The Hon'ble Mr. T.S. Oberoi, Judicial Member.

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.Srinivasan)

In this Review Application, the applicant in OA-974 of 1989 contends that we have committed an error in our order dated 10.7.89 disposing of that application. The error, according to the applicant is that we had not given a ruling on prayer No. (i) in the OA seeking a declaration that on reversion from deputation with the Inland Waterways Authority of India (IWAI), the applicants were entitled to be posted back to their parent department.

We may point out at the outset that the aforesaid order dated 10.7.1989 was dictated in open court in the presence of both the parties to the dispute after hearing them. Moreover we have specifically stated in that order that applicants had already been allowed to join their parent department on 1.6.1989. As such, it was no more necessary to issue a declaration as prayed for by the applicants. That is why we said that what remained of the application at that stage was as to who should pay the salary and allowances of the applicants for the period between 1.5.1989 and 24.5.1989 after their

37  
: 2 :

relied by IWAI when they were not allowed to join in their parent department; that question was decided in our order.

3. Thus, there was no error in our order as contended in this application as we deliberately refrained from giving any direction on a prayer which had in effect been conceded by the respondents themselves by that time by allowing the applicants to report back to their parent department on 1.6.1989.

4. This Review Application is, therefore, rejected by circulation among ourselves in terms of Rule 17(ii) of the Administrative Tribunals (Procedure) Rules, 1987.

*Oberoi* 28.9.89

( T.S. Oberoi )

Member (J)

*P. Srinivasan* 28.9.89

( P. Srinivasan )

Member (A)