IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIFUR BENCH, JAIFUR.

RP 29/94 in OA 245/89

Date of order 9.11.94

Union of India & Others :

Petitioners

V/s

Roshan Lal

: Non-petitioner

Mr. S.S. Hassan

: Counsel for the petitioners

Mr. J.K. Kaushik

: Counsel for the non-petitioner

## CORAM

Hon ble Mr. Gopal Krishna, Member (Judicial)

Hon 'ble Mr. O.P. Sharma, Member (Administrative)

PER HON'BLE MR. GOPAL KRISHNA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Petitioners, Union of India and two others have filed this petition for review under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, praying for a review of the decision rendered in OA 245/89 dated 24.2.94.

- 2. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records.
- decision is sought is that since the non-petitioner was posted on transfer upon his promotion to the PCO as Material Collector from the shop floor, he was entitled to incentives and special pay vide circular dated 30.1.79 (Annexure R-1). It is stated in the review petition that this clarification made vide circular dated 30.1.79 (Annexure R-1) had escaped the notice of the Tribunal as a result of which there was an error apparent on the face of record causing miscarriage of justice and therefore it warrants interference by way of review. It is further stated by the petitioners that the second part of item (iii)

CKNIKE

of Annexure A-8 dated 7.7.78 provides that if the staff members are transferred to the production control organisation as a result of promotion, they will not receive any special pay. It is urged that this aspect of the provisions had also escaped the notice of the Tribunal while deciding the OA. It is obvious from the perusal of the impunged order that these aspects of the circular referred to above were duly considered and the decision was rendered after examining all the implications of Annexure R-1 and item (iii) of Annexure A-8. We find no error apparent on the face of record. There are no other valid grounds justifying a review of the impunged order.

4. We, therefore, find no merit in this Review Petition and it is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(O.P.SHARMA)

MEMBER (A)

GOPAL KRISHNA)

MEMBER(J)