

BY CIRCULATION

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH
ALLAHABAD

Review Application No. 68 of 2002

In

Original Application No.1338 of 1996

Allahabad this the 16th day of August 2002

Hon'ble Mr.C.S. Chadha, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr.A.K. Bhatnagar, Member (J)

1. Kedar Nath Prasad S/o Shri Baboo Lal Prasad aged about 37 years.
2. Tilak Raj S/o Shri Mast Ram, aged about 34 years.
3. Avadesh Kumar S/o Shri Raghunath Sahai, aged about 31 years.
4. Suresh Chandra S/o Shri Ganesh Lal, aged about 33 years.
5. Navin Kumar S/o Shri Radhey Shyam, aged about 36 years.
6. Anil Kumar Mishra S/o Shri Dwarka Nath, aged about 34 years.
7. Hans Nath Mishra S/o Shri Ram Dass Mishra, aged about 47 years.
8. Rajendra Prasad S/o Shri Sheo Shanker, aged about 38 years.
9. Sobh Nath S/o Shri Ram Jiawan, aged about 36 years.
10. Chandra Kishan S/o Shri Nand Lal, aged about 40 years.
11. Imamuddin S/o Shri Yaqub, aged about 22 years.

Beena

All are working in Skilled Artisan Category grade Rs.950-1500/- (RPS) as Fitter(Applicant No.1), Wireman(Applicant No.2 to 8), Carpenter (Applicant No.9), Hammerman(Applicant No.10) and Mason(Applicant No.11) under Chief Signal Inspector Works, Northern Railway, Allahabad.

Applicants

By Advocate Shri S.S. Sharma

Versus

1. Union of India owning and representing Northern Railway, Notice to be served to The General Manager, Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer/Construction Northern Railway, Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6.
3. The Chief Signal & Telecommunication Engineer/Construction, Northern Railway, Baroda House, New Delhi.
4. The Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Allahabad.
5. The Dy.Chief Signal & Telecommunication Engineer/Construction, Northern Railway, Allahabad.

Respondents

By Advocate Shri A.V. Srivastava

O R D E R

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

This review petition has been filed against our order in O.A.No.1338 of 1996 passed on 06.06.2002.

2. The review petition lies only when there is ^{an} error apparent on the face of the record or ⁱⁿ the Judgment ~~on~~ law has been wrongly

[Handwritten Signature]

:: 3 ::
len

cited ~~on the judgment~~. The question of interpretation of law cannot be challenged in the review petition. We have gone through the review petition. It is nothing but a repetition of the O.A. and the petitioner has merely challenged the interpretation of the Court as regards the law obtaining on the subject. We have cited certain Supreme Court and Principal Bench's Judgments to come to our conclusion whereas the learned counsel for the applicant feels that those Judgments are not applicable. This is a matter of interpretation and not wrong application of law. Therefore, we feel that there is no force in the review petition. If the applicant is aggrieved by our order, he may take ~~the~~ recourse ^{to} ~~by~~ filing a *len* writ petition. Review certainly does not lie. We , therefore, reject the review petition.

Am
Member (J)

Chaudhary
Member (A)

/M.M./