

(4)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY
BENCH OF BOMBAY

RP No. 118/94 in
OA 1201/93.

Date of decision 23.1.95

Vijay Maruti Bhingarde and another.

....Petitioners.

Vs.

Union of India & others

....Respondents.

ORDER

This is a Review Petition filed by the applicant in OA 1201 of 1993 disposed of on 17.1.94. The applicant in this R.P. has brought up information that Respondent No. 3 had issued a notice for which the last date of application was 15.2.94 and which came to the knowledge of the applicants only on 27.6.94. Having come to know of this, which is at variance with the directions issued by the Principal Bench in the OA disposed of earlier, the applicants seek regularisation on the post of Graphic Artist or in the alternative the applicants should be regularised as per the scheme approved within a period of 6 months. Pending the hearing and final disposal of the Application respondents may be directed not to act on the notice/advertisement inviting applications for various posts issued by Respondent No. 3.


N/b
2. The R.P. has been filed after delay of 5 months. M.P. No. 993/94 has also been filed alongwith RP seeking condonation of delay. In this MP no valid ground has been given for the delay in filing the R.P. Notice-cum-advertisement must have been issued sufficiently in advance of the closing date from the receipt of the application i.e. 15.2.94.

3. It is unbelievable that the applicants who were agitating for their regularisation should not have been able to learn about this notice-cum-advertisement

(5)

while the matter was agitated before this Bench on 17.1.1993. Curiously, the dates on which notice/advertisement has been issued has not been mentioned. Photo copy does not bear any date of issue of notice/advertisement or even the ^{name} ~~date~~ of paper in which it had appeared. Normally, every such notice/advertisement would give a time margin of at least a month before the announced closing dates. In any case, the matter pertains to the non-compliance of the directions issued under the judgment of the principal Bench in OA No.563/1986 delivered sometime in October, 1990. This needs to be, ^{if at all} ~~therefore~~, taken up as a contempt matter before that Bench and not through Review petition in this Bench. The O.A. before this Bench already stands disposed of, against which this Review petition is directed very much belatedly.

3. In view of the above, the Review petition is dismissed.


(N.K. VERMA)
MEMBER (A)


(M.S. DESHPANDE)
VICE CHAIRMAN