

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDERABAD BENCH : HYDERABAD.

(161)

R.A. NO. 50/96 in  
O.A. NO. 1377/93

DATE OF DECISION 27-8-96

L.Nageswara Rao

(PETITIONER (S)

L.Nageswara Rao (Party-in-person)

ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, Central Secretariat, New Delhi & 7 others RESPONDENT (S)

Shri N.R.Devaraj.

ADVOCATE FOR THE RESPONDENT (S).

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI M.G.CHAUDHARI : VICE-CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI H.RAJENDRA PRASAD : MEMBER (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement ?
4. Whether the Judgement is to be circulated to the other Benches ?

*bill*  
Judgement delivered by Hon'ble Justice Shri M.G.Chaudhari,  
Vice-Chairman.

162

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.50/96

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.1377/93

DATE OF ORDER : 27-8-1996

Between :

L.Nageswara Rao

... Applicant

And

1. The Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
Govt. of India, Central Secretariat,  
New Delhi.
2. The Registrar General, India,  
2/A, Mansingh Road, New Delhi-11.
3. The Deputy Director of Census Operations,  
(Designated as Joint Director of Census  
Operations), A.P.Pioneer House,  
Soma Jiguda, Hyderabad-82.
4. B.V.Ramana Murthy
5. Ch.N.V.Bhadram
6. M.Mohan Rao
7. T.Koteswara Rao
8. Y.Jagan Mohan Reddy

... Respondents

--- --- ---

Counsel for the Applicant : L.Nageswara Rao (party-in-person)

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

--- --- ---

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI M.G.CHAUDHARI : VICE-CHAIRMAN *✓*

THE HON'BLE SHRI H.RAJENDRA PRASAD : MEMBER (A) *✓* 2/18

--- --- ---

(Orders per Hon'ble Justice Shri M.G.Chaudhari,  
Vice-Chairman).

-- -- --

Although the review application could be disposed of by circulation since the applicant appears in person and sought for hearing, we have heard him. The points raised in the

✓ merits which have  
case which has been dealt with in the O.A. and if the applicant  
✓ is of the view that those points are not correctly decided his  
✓ remedy is by way of an appeal. His points are two for review-  
✓ original <sup>says</sup> ing the O.A. order. Firstly he said that he had not argued that  
✓ the promotion is based on the seniority cum fitness/suitability  
✓ and there was no selection prescribed. He submitted that there  
✓ were no recruitment rules at all governing the promotion claimed  
✓ by him. The applicant however <sup>had</sup> very much urged these points and  
✓ these have been dealt with in the judgement. Hence they are  
✓ not open to be re-agitated in a review application. Another  
✓ point argued by the applicant is that recruitment rules  
✓ assuming they apply are held to be prospective in operation  
✓ <sup>not have been as</sup> <sub>in operation</sub>  
✓ and they <sup>app</sup> should/be declared retrospectively apply. We have  
✓ dealt with the recruitment rules and provisions thereof adequately  
✓ in the judgement.

2. Thus no grounds for review have been disclosed. It is made clear to the applicant that it is always open to him to approach the Supreme Court by filing an appeal if he feels aggrieved with our judgement in the Original application. That

166

- 3 -

right is in no way effected by disposal of this Review Application.

3. The Review Application is disposed-of. No costs.

H.Rajendra Prasad  
(H.RAJENDRA PRASAD)

Member (A)

M.G.Chaudhary  
(M.G.CHAUDHARI)  
Vice-Chairman

Dated: 27th August, 1996.  
Dictated in Open Court.

Deputy Registrar (CC)

av1/