

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

Date of Decision: 8th Sept 1992.

R.A NO.232/1992 in O.A.1568/91

Atal Prakash Kain and Others. ..	Applicants
vs.	
Union of India & Others. ..	Respondents
Counsel for the applicants ..	Shri B.B.Raval
Counsel for the respondents ..	Shri R.L.Dhawan

CORAM

Hon'ble Mr.S.P.Mukerji, Vice Chairman

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

1. Whether local reporters may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be reported or not ?

ORDER

(Hon'ble Shri S.P.Mukerji, Vice Chairman)

In this review application the review applicants have questioned the merits of our judgment dated 8th May, 1992 in O.A.1568/91. They have argued that they should be treated in the same manner as Draughtsmen of Moradabad Division have been. They have also questioned the validity of the written test held on 7th September 1991 and have apprehended that the filling up of the vacancies as directed by the Tribunal ^{might} to be rigged by the third respondent. They have also argued that by not fixing a time-limit for considering the applicants on the basis of the July/November 1984 selection, the respondents have been given a long rope to favour others.

2. I have gone through the review application and relevant papers and find that the review application cannot be allowed. The points raised by the applicants

(51) ~~51~~

are matters for filing an appeal but not a review which is permissible only in case of an error apparent on face of records ^{or on} and new material which was not available earlier. If the review applicants are apprehensive of the bonafides of the respondents, they are always at liberty to move appropriate legal forum if so advised and in accordance with law, if they are aggrieved by any action taken or proposed to be taken by the respondents, at an appropriate time.

3. In the circumstances, if Hon'ble Judicial Member agrees, the review application may be rejected by circulation.

S.P.M.
8.9.92

(S.P.MUKERJI)
VICE CHAIRMAN

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

I agree to the above views. The review application accordingly stands rejected, by circulation.

Oberoi 8/9/92
M(J)