

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.**

**RA-255/2015 in
OA-3714/2014**

New Delhi this the 22nd day of July, 2016.

Hon'ble Mr. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)

Lungi Singh (Aged about 65 years),
S/o late Sh. Avtar Singh,
R/o H.No. 4624, Gali No. 112,
Sant Nagar, Burari, New Delhi-110084.
(By Advocate : Sh. B.L. Wanchoo)

... Applicant

Versus

1. Govt. of NCTD through
Chief Secretary,
Delhi Secretariat,
I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002.
2. Chief Engineer,
PWD, Electric Division,
11th Floor, MSO Building,
I.T.O. New Delhi-110002.
3. Executive Engineer,
PWD, Electric Division,
Maint Division, M-153,
11th Floor, MSO Building,
I.T.O. New Delhi-110002.

ORDER (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the review applicant has submitted that in Clause 5(g) of his OA, the applicant has mentioned the judgment of this Tribunal in OA No. 2629/2011 (Nand Lal Vs. GNCTD) decided on 24.11.2011 and upheld by Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No. 5505/2011. He has mentioned this judgment and relied on the same by mentioning that the case was squarely covered by this judgment. However, this has escaped the attention of this Tribunal and the aforesaid judgment has neither been discussed nor distinguished in this

case. Thus an error apparent on the face of the record has crept into the judgment.

2. Learned counsel for the review respondents has opposed this contention by stating that merely because a judgment has not been discussed in the order does not constitute sufficient ground for review.

3. In my opinion, since applicant had pleaded that his case was squarely covered by judgment in Nand Lal vs. GNCTD, this should have been discussed in the order. Since, this has escaped our attention, an error apparent on the face of the record has crept into our judgment. Accordingly, I allow this RA and restore the OA to its original number.

4. List the OA on 13.09.2016 for fresh hearing.

(Shekhar Agarwal)
Member (A)

/ns/