

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

MUMBAI BENCH

R.P. NO. 19/99 IN O.A. 634/98.

Dated this Wednesday, the 5th day of May, 1999.

CORAM : Hon'ble Shri Justice R. G. Vaidyanatha,
Vice-Chairman.

Hon'ble Shri D. S. Baweja, Member (A).

T. N. Ramachandran Iyer ... Review Applicant

Versus

The Secretary to the
Government of India,
Ministry of Urban Affairs. ... Respondents.

Tribunal's Order on Circulation :

{ PER.: SHRI R. G. VAIDYANATHA, VICE-CHAIRMAN }


This is a review petition filed by the applicant seeking review of our order dated 06.04.1999 in O.A. No. 634/98. We have perused the review petition and the entire case file.


2. The applicant's grievance is that he is not given proper fixation of pay when he joined the service in 1956 on the ground that his erstwhile service of five years in the Territorial Army has not been taken into consideration while fixing his pay as L.D.C. in 1956. We have rejected the application by our order dated 06.04.1999 mainly on the ground that it is barred by principles of resjudicata. The applicant has been filing application after application, before one Tribunal or other Tribunal claiming identical reliefs. We have pointed out in our order that applicant's present claim

 ...2

was rejected by the Ernakulam Bench of the Tribunal vide order dated 29.10.1990 in O.A. No. 148/88. Again the applicant filed one more O.A. No. 998/90 before the same Ernakulam Bench for the same relief and the application was dismissed by order dated 27.02.1991. Then the applicant filed a review petition there and it came to be rejected. The applicant filed one more O.A. No. 258/92 before Central Administrative Tribunal at Jabalpur Bench and that also came to be dismissed. In spite of all these three orders against him, the applicant filed the present O.A. for identical reliefs which we have rejected by our order dated 06.04.1999. The applicant in the review petition again reiterates the same grounds as to how he is entitled to fixation of pay when he joined the service are L.D.C. In our view, the applicant cannot be permitted to go on filing application after application for identical reliefs. There is no apparent error or justifiable reasons for reviewing our order. There is no merit in the review petition.

3. In the result, the review petition is rejected by circulation.


(D. S. BAWEJA)
MEMBER (A).


(R. G. VAIDYANATHA)
VICE-CHAIRMAN.