

19

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD.

R.P.No.92/92 in
O.A.No.137/92.

Date of Order : 21.8.1992

1. Ch.Seetharam
2. V.Mohan Rao

.. Applicants/Applicants

Vs.

1. Union of India, Rep. by its
Joint Secretary, Dept. of Space,
Indian Space Research Orgn.,
Anthariksha Bhavan, New BEL Road,
Bangalore-560094.

2. The Head,
Personnel & Genl., Admn., Divn.,
SCF, SHAR Centre, Sriharikota,
Nellore Dt. A.P. .. Respondents/Respondents

Counsel for the Applicants/ ::Shri V.Rajagopal Reddy
Applicants

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

CORAM:

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian : Member(A)

Hon'ble Shri C.J.Roy : Member(J)

{ Order of the Division Bench delivered by Hon'ble Shri
R.Balasubramanian : Member(A) }

(In circulation).

This review petition has been filed by Shri Ch.Seetharam
& another against the Union of India, Rep. by its Joint
Secretary, Dept. of Space, Indian Space Research Organisation,
Anthariksha Bhavan, New BEL Road, Bangalore-560094 & another
under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal(Procedure
Rules, 1987 seeking a review of the judgement dt. 15.7.92 in
O.A.No.137/92.

2. The case of the applicants for a higher scale in the
grade of Office Clerks-B was dismissed based on detailed
reasons. During the hearing it was agreed by the counsels
for both sides that the cases of the applicants are covered
by judgements of this Bench as well as Ernakulam Bench in

similar othercases. All that has been done in the O.A. was a straight and simple application of the judgements by this Bench as well as by the Ernakulam Bench. The applicants are unable to point out any error apparent in the direction. After stating that the case is covered by the decisions of the Ernakulam Bench and this Bench they are now coming up, after the judgement was pronounced, with a plea that a distinction from those judgements would have been made if they had been given an opportunity to be heard. Even now they are unable to point out what error had crept in the judgement which was based on the decisions of the Ernakulam Bench and this Bench. There being no error apparent, we find there is no scope to review and we accordingly dismiss the review petition with no order as to costs.

R. Balasubramanian

(R. Balasubramanian)
Member(A).

urby
(C. J. Roy)
Member(J).

S. Roy 92
Deputy Registrar(Judl.)

Dated: 21st August, 1992.

Copy to:-

1. Joint Secretary, Department of Space, Indian Space Research Organisation, Union of India, Anthariksha Bhavan, New BEL Road, Bangalore-94.
2. The Head, Personnel & General, Administrative Division, SCF, SHAR Centre, Sriharikota, Nellore District, A.P..
3. One copy to Sri. V. Rajagopal Reddy, advocate, No.1, Law Chambers, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad-02.
4. One copy to Sri. N.R. Devaraj, Sr. CGSC, CAT, Hyd-bad.
5. One spare copy.
6. one copy to Hon'ble Mr. C. J. Roy, Judicial member, C.A.T, Hyd.

Rsm/-

Noted

g

20/8/92
21/8/92

R.P. 02/102
in
C.P. 137/92

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

THE HON'BLE MR.

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN : M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY :
MEMBER (J)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER (J)

Dated: 21/8 - 1992

ORDER / JUDGMENT

R.A./C.A./M.A. No 92/192

in

O.A. No. 137/92

T.A. No. (W.P. No _____)

Admitted and interim directions
issued

Allowed.

Disposed of with directions

Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for default

M.A. Ordered / Rejected

No orders as to costs.

pvm.

