

OPEN COURT

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH : ALLAHABAD

CIVIL MISC. REVIEW APPLICATION NO.79 OF 2000

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.835 OF 2000
ALLAHABAD THIS THE 5TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2003

HON'BLE MAJ GEN. K. K. SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER-A

Ghan Shyam,
son of Sahtu,
resident of village and Post Deora Bazar,
Sub Post Tetari,
District-Siddharth Nagar.

.....Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Sanjay Mishra)

Versus

1. Union of India,
through Secretary,
Ministry of Human Resources,
Development, (Department of Education),
Govt. Of India, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.

2. Deputy Director Navodaya Vidyalaya,
Sammitti, A-39 Kailash Colony,
New Delhi.

3. Director Navodaya Vidyalaya Sammitti,
A-39 Kailash Colony,
New Delhi.

.....Respondents

(By Advocate Shri Vinod Swaroop)

O R D E R

This Review Application has been filed for review of
the order dated 30.10.2000 passed in O.A. No.835/00. The
learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the
jurisdiction of the Tribunal in regard to Navodaya Vidyalaya



^{been} has brought in the year 1998^{by notification dated 7.12.98} w.e.f. from 01.12.1999. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that Patna High Court did not pass any specific order regarding representation of the applicant dated 06.09.1996. The Hon'ble Patna High Court passed the following order:-

"8. Learned counsel, however, contended that petitioner in his detailed representation, contained in Annexure-8 dated 6th September, 1996 had requested the Director (respondent no.3) to re-examine his case on the basis of materials placed in that representation, but unfortunately, no reply has yet been given.

9. In my view, it would be always open to the petitioner to pursue his remedy before that authority. But in the facts and circumstances of this case, it would be difficult for this court to interfere with the impugned order. In the result, subject to the observations made above, this writ application is, thus, dismissed."

2. In view of the above, I am not inclined to accept the ground advanced by the applicant's counsel. The order dated 30.10.2000 has already been passed after hearing the parties. On perusal of the record I find that the order is legal and is not liable to be reviewed. There is ^{no} merit in the Review Application. Therefore, the same is rejected.


Member-A

/Neelam/