

**THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
LUCKNOW BENCH**

**Review Application No.10/2007  
In  
Original Application No.563/2005  
This the 17<sup>th</sup> day of July 2007.**

**HON'BLE MR. A.K. SINGH, MEMBER (A)  
HON'BLE MR. M. KANTHAIAH, MEMBER (J)**

Prabhat Kumar Srivastava  
By Advocate: Shri R.K. Tripathi.

...Applicant.

Versus.

Union of India & Others  
By Advocate: None.

.... Respondents.

**ORDER**

**BY HON'BLE MR. M. KANTHAIAH, MEMBER (J)**

The petitioner, who is the applicant in the OA, has filed the Review Application to review the orders of the Tribunal dated 23.3.2007.

2. The petition has been decided under Circulation.  
3. The brief facts of the case are that the applicant filed O.A. challenging the validity of letter Dt. 11.10.2001 (Annexure-1) and letter Dt. 12.6.2006 (Annexure-2) issued by the Respondent No. 2 and 3 respectively, questioned the indent of Notification vide Employment News 1/2000-2001 for the post of JDA/JRA (Civil) and also directions for declaration of the result of final examination on the following grounds: -

(I). The action of the respondents in canceling the indent is wholly illegal, arbitrary and without jurisdiction and also against the Circular dated 20.10.1999.

(II). The canceling power of the indent is only vested with the Railway Recruitment Control Board (RRCB) but not by Railway Recruitment Board (RRB).

(III). No reasons have been assigned for cancellation of these posts of JDA/ JRA (Civil)

and no opportunities was given to the candidates before canceling the indent.

4. The respondents have filed their Counter Affidavit denying the <sup>applicant</sup> contentions raised by the and also his claim.
5. After hearing both sides, this Tribunal has passed order on 23.3.2007 giving reasons on each and every claim of the applicant after full discussion. When there are no valid grounds the claim of the applicant was dismissed by its order Dt. 23.03.2007.
6. Now the applicant has come with this review application stating that the Tribunal ought to have discussed in such a fashion, which is in favour of his claim and also disputing the stand taken by the respondents. Such scope of reappraisal of the matter will be discussed and decided by way of an appeal but not within the scope of review as contemplated in Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. The applicant is entitled for review of the orders if there is any error on the face of record or any typographically mistake in the judgment. But no such grounds are raised in this application to seek indulgence of this Tribunal by way of review of its judgment. Thus the claim of the applicant is beyond the scope of review.
7. In view of the above circumstances, there are no justified grounds to allow the claim of the applicant for review of the order and judgment of the Tribunal Dt. 23.3.2007. Thus, the application is liable for dismissal.

In the result, Review Application is dismissed. No costs.

.....  
**(M. KANTHAIAH)**  
**MEMBER (J)** 17-7-07

  
**(A.K. SINGH)** 17/7/07  
**MEMBER (A)**

/amit/

oR  
copy of order  
Noticed 17-7-07.  
B/w 23-7-07