

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

RA 194/2016 in
OA 3767/2010

New Delhi, this the 16th day of September, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Basu, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. Raj Vir Sharma, Member (J)**

1. Association of UPSC recruited Cameramen
of Doordarshan (Regd)
Q-10/12, 1st Floor, Srinivasupuri
New Delhi
(Through its Secretary, C. Anandan)
2. Mr. C. Jonathan Andrews
Cameraman Grade-II, Doordarshan
3. Mr. D. Nanda Kumar,
Cameraman Grade-II, Doordarshan
4. Mr. S. Anil
Cameraman Grade-II, Room No.10
Doordarshan Kendra, Doordarshan Bhawan
Phase-II, Mandi House,
New Delhi
5. Mr. M. Raja
Cameraman Grade-II
Doordarshan

... Applicants

Versus

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001
2. The Secretary
Union Public Service Commission
Shahjahan Road
New Delhi-110001
3. The Director General
Doordarshan, Mandi House
Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi-110001
4. The Secretary
Department of Personnel & Training

North Block, New Delhi

5. The Secretary
Ministry of Law & Justice
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
6. Shri Ranbir Bhattacharya
Video Executive
Doordarshan Kendra
Kolkatta
7. Shri R.R. Kadam
Cameraman Grade-II
Doordarshan Kendra
Ahmedabad
8. Rajesh Bhatha
Cameraman Grade-I
Doordarshan News, Doordarshan Bhawan,
New Delhi
9. Y.K. Loknath
Cameraman Grade-II
DDK, Bengaluru
10. S.P. Sharma
Under Secretary
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi
11. Doordarshan Cameraman
Welfare Association
Through its President
Pradeep Kumar
CPC Khelgaon, New Delhi
12. Om Prakash
37-D, Pocket-I
Mayur Vihar, Phase-I
New Delhi-110091
13. Soban Singh
Q. No.125-B, Pocket-2
Dilshad Garden,
Delhi-110095
14. Gyan Singh
H.No.473, Sec. 31
Faridabad
15. Mrs. Indu Dang
20/64, Lodhi Colony
New Delhi-110003

....Respondents

ORDER (In Circulation)

Mr. P.K. Basu, Member (A)

This Review Application (RA) has been filed against the order dated 5.08.2016 passed by us in OA 3767/2010.

2. We have gone through the RA and at no point, we find that there is any error apparent on the face of the record. The contents of the RA clearly show that it is merely an attempt to reargue the case. No other sufficient ground for a review has been made out. In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has settled the law. We refer, in particular, to the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati and others**, (2013) 8 SCC 320 and **State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamalsengupta and another**, (2008) 8 SCC 612.

3. The RA being an attempt to reargue the case, cannot be entertained. It is, therefore, dismissed in circulation.

(Raj Vir Sharma)
Member (J)

(P.K. Basu)
Member (A)

/dkm/