

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

AHMEDABAD BENCH

R.A.NO. 48 of 1995 in
 O.A. NO. 169 of 1992.
~~T.A. NO.~~
~~XXXXXXXX~~

DATE OF DECISION 15-11-1995.

Shri N.J.Patel Petitioner

Shri M.S.Trivedi Advocate for the Petitioner (s)

Versus

Union of India and others Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. N.B.Patel : Mice Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. K.Ramamoorthy : Member (A)

JUDGMENT

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

No

Shri N.J. Patel,
working as Goods Guard,
Western Railway,
Mehsana.

...Applicant.

(Advocate : Mr.M.S.Trivedi)

Versus

1. Union of India, ~~xxx~~ through
The General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate,
Bombay.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Rajkot Division,
Rajkot.
3. Senior Divisional Operating Supdt.,
DRM Office,
Western Railway,
Rajkot.

...Respondents.

(BY CIRCULATION)

ORDER

R.A.NO. 48 of 1995
in
O.A.NO. 169 of 1992.

Date : 15.11.199


Per : Hon'ble Mr.K.Ramamoorthy : Member (A)


7
The application for review has been filed on the ground that the Tribunal had not taken into account the correct Rule on the subject.

2. The matter pertains to assignment of seniority which is conditional on completion of training by the applicant as has been indicated in the order itself. fact of applicant having refused training when he was

in 1988 is also not indisputed. The question of the applicant having not been sent for immediate subsequent batches was not the issue in dispute and it is for the first time in the Review Application, reference has been made to there having been nine subsequent training batches. In any case, since the seniority is a factor which is conditional on training and the grievance relates to assignment of seniority ^{does not relate to} and not being selected for any particular subsequent batch, the question of there being any error in law or in fact on this aspect does not arise.

Hence, Review Application is rejected.


(K. Ramamoorthy)
Member(A)


(N.B. Patel)
Vice Chairman

ait.