

13

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

RA 39/2000 in OA No.564/99

DATE OF ORDER : 1-6-2000

Between :-

K.V.Nagendra Kumar

...Applicant

And

1. The General Manager,
SCR, Rail Nilayam, Sec'bad-71.
2. The Chief Personnel Officer,
SCR, Sec'bad-71.
3. The Sr.Divisional Personnel Officer,
Guntakal Divisional Office, SCR,
Guntakal-515 801.
4. Sr.Divisional Engineer/Co-ordination,
SCR, Guntakal Division, Guntakal-515801.
5. P.Nalini Rama Rao

...Respondents

--- --- ---

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri S.Ramakrishna Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Rajeshwar Rao, CGSC

--- --- ---

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

(Order per Hon'ble Shri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J)).

J

--- --- ---

...2.

(Order per Hon'ble Shri B.S.Jai Parameshwar, Member (J)).

-- -- --

Heard Sri S.Ramakrishna Rao, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri V.Rajeshwar Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

2. Applicant has filed this application praying for review of the order dated 8.3.2000 passed in OA 564/99. In this application the applicant requested for conducting the supplementary Examination on the ground that the examination conducted on 4.5.1996 was not intimated to him by the respondent authorities.

After hearing the parties we formed ^{an} ~~opinion~~ ^{Colleague} ~~opinion~~ that a colleague in the Department ^{where the applicant was working} had attended the examination conducted on 4-5-1996 and ~~that~~ ^{was} there ~~is~~ no reason to believe that the applicant was not intimated about the date of the supplementary examination. We formed an opinion that the supplementary examination need not be conducted ^{for} ~~in~~ an ex-cadre post. The applicant contends that the respondents have not intimated about the date of the examination held on 4-5-1996.

3. Considering the facts available and also decision taken earlier, we do not find any reason to review the order dated 8.3.2000. In fact we have observed that Supplementary Examination cannot be conducted for an ex-cadre post. When that is so, the applicant cannot claim for a chance to appear for Supplementary Examination on the pretext that he was not aware of the date of the examination. In that view of the matter, there are no grounds to review the order dt. 8.3.2000. Hence the R.A. dismissed. No costs.

av1/


B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR

Member (J)

Dated: 1st June, 2000. (Dictated in Open Court)


(R.RANGARAJAN)

Member (A)