IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH

AT HYDERABAD.

R.P. No. 23 194 and WA.311 /94 Date of Order: 26-4-94.

Divl. Personnel Officer, S.E.Rly., Waltair.

..Applicant

٧s.

- Authority under Payment of Wages Act, Office of the Dy. Labour Commissioner, Dwarakanagar, Visakhapatnam.
- 2. Appellate Authority under Payment of Wages Act, District Court Buildings, Visakhapatnam.
- Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Port Area, Visakhapatnam.
- 4. D. Charles

.. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant :: Shri N.R.Devaraj, Sr. CGSC

Counsel for the Respondents:: Shri D.Panduranga Reddy

Shri P.Krishna Reddy for R4.

CORAM

Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi : Member (A)

Hon'ble Shri T. Chandrasekhar Reddy : Member(J)

<u>Order</u>

X of the Division Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri A.B.Gorthi, Member(A) X

(In circulation)

By means of this Review Application, the Divl. Personnel Officer, S.E.Rly., Visakhapatnam seeks a reconsideration of our judgement dt. 24.12.93 in O.A.No.315/90. The O.A. was filed by the Review Applicant herein for setting aside the order of the Appellate Authority under Payment of Wages Act confirming the order of the Authority under Payment of

....2

Copy to:-

- 1. Authority under Payment of Wages Act, 0/0 Dy. Labour Commissioner, Dwarakanagar, Visakhapatnam.
- 2. Appellate Authority under Payment of Wages Act. District Court Buildings, Visakhapatnam.
- 3. Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Port Area, Visakhapatnam.
- 4. Divisional Personnel Orficer, S.E.Railway, Waltair.
- 5. One capy to Sri. N.R.Davaraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd.
- 6. One copy to Sri. D.Panduranga Reddy, Spl. counsel for A.P.State.
- 7. One copy to Sri. P.Krishna Reddy, advecate, CAT, Hyd.
- 8. One spare copy.

Ram/- 454

7 4 4 5 5 7 5 5



Wages Act in P.W.Case No.7/84 and to declare that Shri D.Charles (R4) is not entitled to the benefits of differential wages for the period between 1977 and 1983. In the said judgement we noted that Shri D.Charles was given promotion with effect from the due date keeping in view the date of promotion of his junior but he was denied the consequential monetary benefits. Having heard learned counsel for both the parties and having carefully examined the material before us we came to the considered view that the order of the P.W. Authority granting monetary benefits to R4 suffered from no such irregularity as would warrant our interference. The O.A. was thus dismissed.

- were re-agitated alleging that we overlooked the same in our judgement in the O.A. A perusal of our judgement would show that the various issues raised by the parties were duly considered and analysed. In any case, the scope of review does not extend to advancing further arguments, either old or new. The Review Petition fails to bring out any such error in our judgement as would justify a review of it.
- 3. In the result, the Review Application is rejected.
- 4. As the Review Application has been filed beyond the period of limitation, it is supported by M.A.No.311/94 seeking condonation of delay. As we are rejecting the Review Application on merits, no useful purpose would be served by condoning the delay. Hence M.A.No.311/94 is dismissed.

(T.Chandrasekhar Reddy)
Member(J).

Dated: 2L April, 1994.

br.

(A.B.Gorthi) Member(A)

Dy Registrat (J)

conta -- 3/-.

52 ~

R.D-512: 570794.
6.A-3157901

TYPED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'ELE MR.JUSTICE V.NEELADRI RAO
VICE CHAIRMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.A.B.GORTHI : MEMBER(AD)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.TCCHANDRASEKHAR REDDY MEMBER(JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.R RANGARAJAN : M(ADMN)

Dated: 26/4/1994

ORDER/JUDGMENT

A/R.A./C.A/No. (570794)

2 17 23 184 and WA 3111

O.A.No.

311790

T.A. 10. (w.p.

Admitted and Interim Directions Issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for Default.

Rejected/Ordered.

No order as to costs.

Control Administrative Tribunal
DESPATCH
2 UM A) 1994
HYDERABAD BENCE

•