

59

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

Regn.No. RA No.179/92 in
OA 1363/90

Date of decision:21.05.1992

Dr. I.K. Bhatnagar

•••Original applicant/
respondents in the
RA

Vs.

Union of India & Others

•••original
respondents/
petitioner in the
RA

CORAM:

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

The Hon'ble Mr. B.N. DHOUNDIYAL, 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 Shri P.K. Kartha,
Vice Chairman(J))

The petitioner in this RA is the original respondent in OA 1363/90 which was disposed of by judgment dated 1.4.1992. The original applicant who was working as Project Officer in the National Research Laboratory for Conservation of Cultural Property (N.R.L.C.) had prayed for a direction to the respondents to declare him entitled to be granted relaxation, like Dr. Nair, in the requirement of five years' service as Project Officer so as to make him eligible to be called for interview for the

a

post of Director, NRLC, to interview him and if selected, appoint him to the said post with all consequential benefits.

2. After hearing the learned counsel of both parties and going through the records of the case, the application was disposed of with the direction to the respondents to hold a fresh selection for the post of Director, NRLC, as the applicant had by then become eligible in all respects under the Recruitment Rules. His suitability should be considered along with other eligible candidates. In case he is found suitable for appointment, he should be appointed to the post of Director, NRLC. The respondents were directed to comply with the above directions preferably within a period of 6 months from the date of communication of the order. It was also made clear that in case the respondents had already filled up the post by appointing Dr. Nair, his appointment would continue upto 30.09.1992 or till fresh selection, as directed above, was finalised, whichever is earlier.

3. After going through the RA, we do not see any good ground for reviewing our judgment. We see no error of law apparent on the face of the judgment. The petitioner has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgment.

The RA is accordingly rejected.

B. N. Dhoondiyal
(B.N. DHOUNDIYAL)
MEMBER (A)
21.05.1992

P. K. Kartha
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)
21.05.1992