

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
ALLAHABAD BENCH,  
ALLAHABAD

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.24 OF 2007

IN

OA.No.1470/2003

DATE OF ORDER: 25<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2007

**HON'BLE MR. M.JAYARAMAN, MEMBER 'A'**

1. Shri Lalman, Chaukidar,  
Regional Carpet Store, Ashapur,  
Varanasi,
2. Shri Rakesh Kumar Srivastav, Chaukidar,  
Regional Carpet Store, Ashapur,  
Varanasi,
3. Shri Ram Sewak Maurya, Chaukidar,  
Regional Carpet Store, Ashapur,  
Varanasi,
4. Shri Rajendra Kumar, Chaukidar,  
Regional Carpet Store, Ashapur,  
Varanasi,

Applicants

By Advocate Shri B.N.Chaturvedi

Vs.

1. Union of India through Secretary,  
Textiles, Govt. of India, New Delhi,
2. The Development Commissioner (Handicraft),  
O/o DC (Handicraft), West Block No.7,  
R.K.Puram, New Delhi,

3. The Assistant Director (A&C),  
O/o DC (H) Service Centre,  
Singra, Varanasi.

.. Respondents

By Advocate Shri Saumitra Singh

ORDER

By Mr. M.Jayaraman, Member (A)

I have gone through the Review Application. The main ground taken by the applicants here is that the Order dated 8.2.2007 in OA No.1470/2003 has been passed relying on the letter dated 5.8.99 regarding ban on recruitment and that the carpet scheme staff were rendered surplus, whereas the case of the applicants is one of regularization and that the applicants were working in stores section which has not been rendered surplus.

2. I have duly considered the above matter and in my humble view, all the issues raised by rival sides, have been fully discussed in paras 4 to 6. It is specifically stated by the respondents that the Ministry of Finance imposed a ban on creation of the plan and non-plan posts including Group 'B', 'C' and 'D' posts vide letter dated 05.08.1999 and accordingly all the staff including Chaukidars except temporary status Chaukidars have been/are to be placed in the Surplus Cell for redeployment and that applicants herein are getting full benefit of salary, annual increments etc. like regular Chaukidars as per the direction of the Government of India dated 10.09.1993 but they cannot be regularized for want of vacancy. All the above facts have been duly taken into consideration before coming to a conclusion to dismiss the OA.



3. In my view, there is no error apparent on record calling for review of the order passed. The Review Application deserves to be dismissed. If the applicants are aggrieved by the order, they are free to pursue the appellate ~~appeal~~ remedies available under the Act before the competent court.

4. The Review Application is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.



(M.JAYARAMAN)  
MEMBER (ADMN.)