

16

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**RA 138/2005 in
OA 2931/2004**

New Delhi, this the 06th day of July, 2005

**Hon'ble Mrs. Meera Chhibber, Member (J)
Hon'ble Mr. S. K. Malhotra, Member (A)**

**Smt. Anuradha Raj Joshi
R/o A-20, Hyderabad Estate, He-pean-Sea Road,
Mumbai - 36**

..Review Applicant

Versus

Union of India through:

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting
Government of India, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. Chief Exclusive Officer
Prasar Bharati
PTI Building, Parliament Street,
New Delhi – 110 001.
3. Director General
Doordarshan,
Mandi House, New Delhi – 110 001.
4. Director General
All India Radio
Akashwani Bhawan, Parliament Street
New Delhi-1.
5. R. Shanmugasrindaram
6. Khurshed Ahmed Wani
7. Mrs. S.J. Rizvi
8. Mr. P.K. Ray

Officers at sr. no. 5 to 8 are working under
D.G., Doordarshan, The copies to them are
to be served through D.G. Doordarshan,
Mandi House, New Delhi-110 001.

Union of India & Ors.

...Respondents.

ORDER (In Circulation)

By Hon'ble Mr. S.K. Malhotra

This application has been filed by the applicant seeking review of the
order dated 17.05.2005 in OA 2931/2004.

e


2. The Original Application was filed by the applicant with the prayer to set aside the impugned order dated 29.10.2004 by which she had been denied promotion and had been reverted to the Junior Time Scale in the programme production cadre of Doordarshan. This OA was dismissed mainly on the ground that the applicant was not found "fit" for regular promotion by the DPC and the Tribunal was not inclined to interfere in the proceedings of a duly constituted Selection Committee. During the course of discussion in the OA, a new fact was brought to our notice that the applicant had appended a letter dated 25.6.2001 in the OA, addressed to The Director General by the Station Director recommending expunction of the adverse remarks in her ACR for the period 1999-2000. According to the respondents, this letter had been found fake and a vigilance enquiry had also been initiated in this regard. This fact has been brought out in para 9 of the order dated 17.5.2005, but this was not the reason for the dismissal of the OA. N

3. The main point raised in the RA is that the observation of the Tribunal that the said letter dated 25.6.2001 is a fake one is not based on facts as the Officer who had signed the letter was neither asked to file any affidavit nor a report of the handwriting expert was available. The respondents also did not file any affidavit regarding the genuineness of the letter dated 25.6.2001.


4. The order of the Tribunal can be reviewed only if there is a glaring mistake apparent on the face of the record. No such mistake has been pointed out as explained above. Whether the letter dated 25.6.2001 is a genuine one or not is a matter under enquiry by the Vigilance Section of the respondents. In any case, this was not the reason for the dismissal of the OA. As explained above, the OA was dismissed, as the Tribunal cannot be expected to play the role of an appellate authority in the proceedings of a duly constituted DPC who had not found the applicant "fit" for promotion on regular basis. We, therefore, do not find any justifiable reason for review of the order on the grounds mentioned in the RA. 4

5. The applicant by means of this RA has tried to get the matter reopened on a ground, which is not permissible under the Rules. The provisions of Rule 1 of

1

the order XLVII of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, are also not attracted in this case. 

6. In view of the above, the Review Application turns out to be without any merit and the same is dismissed by circulation.


(S.K. Malhotra)
Member (A)


(Mrs. Meera Chhibber)
Member (J)

/pkr/