

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH
.....

Commercial Complex(BDA),
Indiranagar,
Bangalore- 560 038.

Dated: 07-12-87

REVIEW APPLICATION NO 121 /87 ()

W.P.No. _____

APPLICANT

Vs

RESPONDENTS

Shri K. Udaya Kumar

The Ex-Officio Addl Secy to the Govt. of India,
Telecom Board & 2 Ors

To

1. Shri K. Udaya Kumar
S/o Shri K. Narasimha Shetty
Jeppinamogaru
Thondalige
Mangalore - 574192
2. Shri G.S. Hegde
Advocate
No. 181, Kileri Road
Bangalore - 560 053

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~STAY~~/
~~INTERIM ORDER~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said Review application
on 2-12-87.

RECEIVED @ 20/12/87

Diary No. 1501/07/87

Jud Date: 9/12/87

Encl: as above.

R. V. Unnikrishnan
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH; BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF DECEMBER, 1987.

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman
Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan, Member(A).

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 121/87

K. Udaya Kumar,
S/o K. Narasimha Shetty,
r/o Jappinamogaru,
Thondalige,
Mangalore-584192.

... Applicant.

(G.S. Hedge, Advocate)

Vs

1. Ex-officio Additional Secretary
to the Government of India,
Telecommunications Board,
Department of Telecommunications,
Sanchar Bhavan,
20, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi-110 001.
2. The General Manager,
(Telecom)
Maruthi Complex,
Gandhinagar,
Bangalore-9.
3. Assistant Engineer (Cables)
Mangalore-575001.

... Respondents

This application having come up for Admission, Hon'ble Member

Shri P. Srinivasan, made the following:

ORDER

By this review application, the applicant wants us to review
our order dated 2.11.1987 passed in A.No. 674/87(F).

2. The applicant contends in his application that some grounds
raised in the application have not been considered by us in our order
and that, therefore, our order suffers from an error apparent on the
face of the record.

...2/-



3. We are unable to agree with the contention that our order suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record. We have examined the applicant's claim in detail and have observed that his appointment as a casual labourer did not give him a right to continue in service. His services were terminated because of a policy decision taken by the P & T Department not to make casual appointments and to dispense with the services of persons who were given casual appointments after 30.3.1985. In the circumstances, we held that there was no legal infirmity in the action of the respondents and dismissed the application. If the applicant feels that our decision is wrong, the remedy open to him is an appeal and not a review. We cannot sit in judgement over our own order and come to a different decision.

5. In view of the above, the review application is rejected in limine.

Sd/-
VICE-CHAIRMAN

2/12/87

Sd/-
MEMBER(A)

-True copy-



R. V. Venkatesh
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE