

Open Court

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Allahabad Bench, Allahabad.

Dated: Allahabad, this the 30th Day of June, 2000

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr. Rafiq Uddin, J.M.

Review Petition No. 72 of 1997.

in

Original Application No. 1748 of 1992.

Anil Kumar Mishra
son of Sri Uma Shanker Mishra,
r/o Nibi Post Shukulpur,
Distt. Allahabad.

... Applicant.

Counsel for the Applicant: Sri Satish Dwivedi, Adv.

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Railway, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Railway, Government of India, New Delhi.
3. The General Manager (P.) Northern Railways Baroda House, New Delhi.
4. The Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi through its Secretary.
5. The Railway Recruitment Board, New Annexe Building, D.R.M's. Office Compound, Nawab Yusuf Road, Allahabad, through its Chairman.

... Respondents.

-2-

Order (Open Court)

(By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member (A.)

This Review Application has been filed for recalling order in O.A. 1748/92 dated 26.2.97. Copy of the order was ready on 20.3.97. The Review application has been filed on 30.4.97/6.5.97.

2. The review is sought on the ground that the Railway Recruitment Board had considered the eligibility of the applicant on the ground of age and had called him for ~~his~~ written as well as Viva-Voce and had thereafter recommended his name to the department for appointment to the post of Diesel Foreman (Mechanical). The appointing authority had therefore no jurisdiction to deny appointment to the applicant on the ground of non-eligibility for having crossed proper age limit. The contention of the applicant is that the applicant should have been granted age relaxation if he was considered over-age by the respondents. It is also contended that the case law cited by the applicant has not been appreciated properly by the Bench of the Tribunal. The applicant has treated these as errors apparent on the face of the record and sought review of the order dated 26.2.97.

3. The applicant has clearly treated the findings of the Bench of the Tribunal as errors apparent on the face of the record and the contention

-3-

is thus, that the Bench has erred in reaching those findings. Such errors do not fall in the category of errors apparent on the face of the record.

4. There are no other grounds which justify review of the order dated 26.2.97 in O.A. 1748 of 1992. The application for review is, therefore, dismissed as lacking in merits.

Rafiquddin
Member (J.)

Haider
Member (A.)

Nafees.