

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE  
TRIBUNAL ADDITIONAL BENCH,  
BANGALORE**

**ORDER SHEET**

Applicant

H. N. Kartikey

Advocate for Applicant

Sh. K. Subba Rao.

Respondent

Ex. 86 Health Services Corp.

Advocate for Respondent

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
12-1-87	<p>This application has been filed by the Applicant u/s 22(F) of the Act, Praying to Review Order dt. 17-12-86 passed by the Bench of this Tribunal in A.No. 167/86 (T) Comprising Hon'ble Member (Tudl) &amp; Hon'ble Member (A) (Sh. L. H. A. Rao).</p> <p>A fee for Rs 25/- has been paid.</p> <p>Submitted pl.</p> <p><i>R. K. Rao</i> BHU/87</p> <p>Registers</p> <p>Register of new posts post before leave Court Hallwood 200 Admiralty Meersing a/c 16/87 S/1371</p> <p>2003 J. 131</p>	<p>(Ch RKR)MJ/LHAR(M(A))</p> <p>16-1-87 R. A. NO. 6/87 <u>ORDER</u> (A No. 167/86)</p> <p>None present for the applicant. Shri M.S. Padmara-jaiah, senior C.G.S.C. for the respondents.</p> <p>We have perused the objections filed by the applicant under Section 22(F) of the Administrative Tribunals Act 1985.</p> <p>Among the grounds justifying review of an order passed by this Tribunal, the relevant one is that the order could be reviewed if an error is apparent on the face of the order discernible. On a careful perusal of the order we do not find any error in our order and we do not find any ground for reviewing the same since we have considered the matter <u>in extenso</u>.</p> <p>The contention of the petitioner is that certain posts of Drivers were still vacant in NTI for being filled in and the applicant should be considered in the matter of filling up the vacant posts.</p> <p>In fact, we have already dealt with this <del>contention</del> prayer of the applicant and have also given necessary directions in para 7 of the Order.</p>

Date	Office Notes	Orders of Tribunal
	<p><u>16.1.87</u></p> <p>The Hon'ble Shri. Ch. Ramakrishna Rao, M(J)</p> <p>The Hon'ble Shri. LHA Rego M(A).</p> <p>Sri. K. Subbarao for Application absent.</p> <p>Sri. M. S. Padmanabhan Counsel for Respondent present.</p> <p>Arguments Concluded.</p> <p>R.A. Rejected -</p> <p>B.D. D eO CH<sub>2</sub></p> <p>30-1-87 order dt. 16-1-87 issued to all the Parties Concerned TRB.</p>	<p>We, therefore, do not find any reason to elaborate on the direction of the Tribunal.</p> <p>In the result, the objection lacks substance and is rejected.</p> <p><i>Ch. Ramakrishna Rao</i> Member (J)</p> <p><i>Ch. LHA Rego</i> Member (A) 16-1-87</p>