

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

11

RA 379/92 in OA 1393/92

Date of Decision : 23.12.1992

Mrs. Amarjeet Kaur vs. Union of India & Ors.

ORDER

The applicant of OA 1393/92 has filed this Review Application against the judgment and order dt. 3.11.1992 by which the application was partly allowed with the direction to the respondents that if the applicant reports within a period of one month to join the post of Staff Nurse, she may be allowed to join on the prescribed scale of pay from the date of joining and may also consider on the ground of eligibility or on compassionate ground for allotment of eligible type of residence in her favour.

2. The review applicant is aggrieved by an observation in the judgment that the respondents shall be free to take action against her for eviction and realisation of damages for over stay according to the law as per Extant Rules.

3. It is averred in the Review Application that the main issue and the relief claimed in the OA was a direction to the respondents to act in terms of the letter dt. 24.3.1992 and the retention of the Government accommodation of Bungalow No. 116 Bhagat Singh Marg or the licence fee etc. was not the issue before the Tribunal. Thus it is said that there is an error apparent on the face of the record of the judgment and the judgment be reviewed. In the OA, in para-9, the applicant has also prayed for grant of an interim relief that the respondents be restrained from evicting the

1

12

applicant from Bungalow No. 116, Bhagat Singh Marg, New Delhi and charge the normal licence fee till she is allotted a due type of accommodation on her being allowed to join the appointed post. Thus the averment made in the Review Application that the issue of the residence No. 116, Bhagat Singh Marg was not raised in the said OA, is against the record. In fact on 27.5.1992, a stay was granted that the applicant should not be evicted and no recovery should be effected from the applicant. Annexure A16 enclosed along with the application also goes to show that the applicant was served with a demand notice dt. 3.9.1991 regarding premises No. 116 Bhagat Singh Marg, New Delhi.

4. There is no error apparent on the face of the record and no case is made out for review of the judgment.
5. The Review Application is, therefore, dismissed.

J. P. Sharma
(J. P. SHARMA)
23.12.92
MEMBER (J)