

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

R.A. NO. 287/2004

IN

O.A. NO. 1453/2004

NEW DELHI THIS 1st DAY OF NOVEMBER 2004

HON'BLE SH. JUSTICE V.S. AGGARWAL, CHAIRMAN,
HON'BLE SH. S.A. SINGH, MEMBER (A)

1. Dr. P N Shukla,
Working as Scientific Officer in the
Commission for Scientific and Technical Terminology,
West Block No. VII,
R K Puram, New Delhi

.....Applicant

VERSUS

1. Union of India through Secretary,
Department of Secondary Education and Higher Education,
Ministry of Human Resource Development,
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. The Director,
Central Hindi Directorate,
West Block No. VII,
R K Puram, New Delhi
3. Chairman
Commission on Scientific and aDTechnical Terminology,
West Block No. VII,
R K Puram, New Delhi.
4. Smt. Shashi Gupta Working as AD (Subject) in the
Commission for Scientific and Technical Terminology,
West Block No. VII, R K Puram, New Delhi

✓

12

5. Shri Umakant Khubalkar
Working as RO in the office of respondent
No.2 and to be served through her.

.....Respondents

ORDER (IN CIRCULATION)

By Hon'ble Shri S.A. Singh, Member (A)

The applicant had filed OA No. 1453/2004 which had been dismissed vide order dated 8th September 2004.

2. The Review applicant has sought recall and review of this order on the ground that the order of the Tribunal dated 8.9.2004 was perverse because it was based on the judgement dated 17.12.2003 in OA No.1642/2003. This judgement was based on a clarification given by the respondents, which did not entitle respondents No. 4 and 5 for promotion to the grade of Asstt. Director (Subject) . Moreover , the Tribunal had erred because the Review Applicant and the applicant in the earlier OA No.1642/2003 all belong to the subject stream whereas respondent No. 4 & 5 do not belong to the subject stream and hence are not eligible for promotion in this stream.

3. On the basis of these errors the review applicant is seeking recall and review of the order dated 8.9.2004.


4. We find no reasons to accept the arguments of the review applicant because a reading of Tribunal's order dated 8.9.2004 (specifically in para 4,5 and 6) it is clear that the issues raised by the


✓

review applicant have already been taken into consideration while dismissing the OA.

13

5. The Review applicant through this RA is trying to re-argue this case which is not permitted. The only error apparent on the face of the record is a typographical error in para 7. The date of the impugned order in para 7 has been incorrectly typed as 27.5.2004 whereas in para 5 it has been correctly shown as 27.4.2004. The date in para 7 should also be read as 27.4.2004. With this correction the RA No. 287/2004 is disposed of being without merit.


(S.A. Singh)
Member (A)


(V S Aggarwal)
Chairman

Patwal/