

In the Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi

11

Regn. No. RA- 99/92 In  
CA-3077/91

Date: 18.12.1992

Shri Chandrik Prakash .... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Anr. .... Respondents

For the Petitioner .... Shri S.K. Gupta, Counsel

For the Respondents .... Shri P.H. Ramchandani,  
Sr. Counsel.

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (Judl.)  
Hon'ble Mr. P.H. Ramchandani, Administrative Member.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not? No

(Judgement by Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, V.C.)

The present R.A. has been filed by the original applicant in CA-3077/91 which was disposed of by judgement dated 14.2.1992. The original applicant, who had worked as a casual labourer in the office of the respondents, was aggrieved due to the disengagement of his services on the ground of general unsuitability.

After going through the records of the case and hearing the learned counsel for both the parties, the Tribunal found no merit in the application and the same was dismissed.

2. On careful consideration, we see no error of law apparent on the face of the judgement. The petitioner

✓

.... 2...

✓ 12

has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement. The case law relied upon by him at the time of hearing of the case, has been discussed in the judgement. It may be that the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the Tribunal, in which event, the proper course for him is to prefer an appeal against the judgement in the Supreme Court and not to reagitate the matter by filing a review petition. The review application is, accordingly, dismissed.

B. N. Dholiwal  
(B.N. Dholiwal) 18/12/52  
Administrative Member

18/12/52  
(P.K. Kartha)  
Vice-Chairman (Judl.)