

15

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

R.P.No.115/93 in
O.A.No.882/92.

Date of Order : 15-11-1993

M.S.Bhaskaran Pillai .. Applicant
Vs.

Union of India, Rep. by

1. General Manager,
S.C.Rly., Secunderabad.

2. Chief Personnel Officer,
S.C.Rly., Secunderabad.

3. Chief Engineer(Bridges),
S.C.Rly., Secunderabad.

4. Works Manager,
Engineering Workshop,
S.C.Rly., Lallaguda,
Secunderabad.

5. G.Subba Ramaiah .. Respondents

Counsel for the Applicant :: Shri M.C.Pillai

Counsel for the Respondents:: Shri J.R.Gopal Rao, SC for Rlys

CORAM:

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

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

O r d e r

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

(In circulation).

In this Review Application, the first point agitated is that in para 5 of the judgement in O.A.No.882/92 a reference was made to S.C.Rly., Serial Circular No.218/73 and that thereafter the Tribunal proceeded ~~proceeded~~ on the assumption that promotion to the post of Chargeman 'B' is not

.....2

B

on the basis of selection but on the basis of seniority-cum-suitability. This contention is misconceived. When our attention was drawn to the Establishment Serial Circular No.218/73 by the Applicant's counsel, we found that it essentially related to filling up of non-selection post. A reference therein was made to Railway Board's letter No.E(56)/PM1/19/3 dt. 9.7.56 which governed the policy relating to holding of Supplementary Examination in the case of selection post. The purport of it was noted in the same para with a further observation that the said letter dt. 9.7.56 was, however, not produced before us. Consequently, we adverted to para 223 of Indian Railway Establishment Manual which undisputedly relates to the holding of Supplementary Selection Test.

2. The next contention raised by the Review Applicant is more or less a re-argument of the case. The aspect raised in the Review Petition was sufficiently dealt with and commented upon in our judgement dt. 15.9.93. We, therefore, find no merit in the Review Petition which is hereby dismissed. No costs.

T. Chandrasekhara Reddy
(T.Chandrasekhara Reddy)
Member(J).

(A.B.Gorthi)
Member(A).

Dated: 15 Nov., 1993.

Deputy Registrar

br.

To

1. The General Manager, S.C.Rly, Union of India, Secunderabad.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer, S.C.Rly, Secunderabad.
3. The Chief Engineer (Bridges) S.C.Rly, Secunderabad.
4. The Works Manager, Engineering Workshop, S.C.Rly, Lallaguda, Sec'bad
5. One copy to Mr.M.C.Pillai, Advocate, CAT.Hyd.
6. One copy to Mr.J.R.Gopal Rao, SC for Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Library, CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm