

under Circulation

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH,  
ALLAHABAD

Review petition No. 37 of 2001. Inre.  
Original Application No. 1663/92  
this the 21st day of August, 2001.

HON'BLE MR. RAFIQ UDDIN, MEMBER (J)  
HON'BLE MR. S. BISWAS, MEMBER (A)

Surendra Kumar Johri, S/o late Sri Lal Bahadur Johri, Ex-Sanitary Inspector of Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly (U.P.), R/o H.No. 384 Bihrana Pura, Chowk, Takia, Bareilly.

Applicant.

Versus.

Union of India through the Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.

2. Director, Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, District Bareilly (U.P.)

Respondents.

O R D E R

RAFIQ UDDIN, MEMBER (J)

This Review petition has been filed seeking review of the order dated 13.3.2001 passed by a Division Bench of this Tribunal in O.A. no. 1663/92. By the said order, the O.A. filed by the applicant seeking direction to suspend the operation of the retirement notices dated 30.1.91 and 19.9.92 and also declaration to the effect that the post of Sanitary Inspector occupied by the applicant be placed in the technical category, was dismissed on merits.

2. The Review petition has been filed mainly on the ground that the Tribunal has failed taking into consideration the documentary evidence brought on record by the applicant to prove his claim and the Tribunal has also failed to consider and decide the specific points raised by the applicant's counsel.

It may be stated that this Tribunal in the order, in question, has specifically held after considering the entire material on record that the post of Sanitary Inspector cannot be classified as Technical post and as a result of which the applicant is not entitled to the benefit of the aforesaid technical category. It is evident that the applicant seeks review of the order on merit, which is not permissible under law. The scope of review is very limited. We, therefore, do not find any error apparent on the face of the record. The Review petition is, therefore, misconceived and is liable to be dismissed. The Review petition is accordingly dismissed.

*S. B. B.*

MEMBER (A)

*Ravi M. D.*

MEMBER (J)

GIRISH/-