

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

**RA No. 262/2016  
In  
OA No.3215/2016**

New Delhi this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016

**Hon'ble Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)**

N.C.Goel  
Aged around 64 years  
S/o Mr. Damodar Dass  
R/o G-1106, Amrapali Sapphire  
Sector-45, Noida-201301  
Presently posted at :  
Pusa Institute of Technology  
Pusa, New Delhi.

-Review Applicant

(By Advocate:Shri Sourabh Ahuja)

VERSUS

1. Govt. of NCT of Delhi  
Through its Chief Secretary  
Delhi Sachivalaya  
I.P.Estate, New Delhi-2
2. Principal Secretary/Secretary  
Department of Training & Technical Education  
GNCT of Delhi  
Muni Maya Ram Marg  
Pitam Pura, Delhi -88.
3. Deputy Director (E-I)  
Department of Training & Technical Education  
GNCT of Delhi  
Muni Maya Ram Marg  
Pitam Pura, Delhi-88.
4. Director  
Directorate of Education  
Old Secretariat  
Delhi- 110 054.
5. Deputy Director of Education (North)  
Directorate of Education  
GNCT of Delhi  
Lancers Road, Delhi-54.

6. The Principal  
 Pusa Institute of Technology  
 Directorate of Training & Technical Education  
 GNCT of Delhi  
 Pusa, New Delhi. ... Respondents

**O R D E R (Oral)**

**Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J):**

Heard the learned counsel for the Review Applicant.

2. The OA No.3215/2016 was disposed of on 22.09.2016 by directing the respondents to consider the representation of the applicant and pass appropriate speaking and reasoned order thereon.

3. The Original Applicant filed the present Review Application seeking review of the aforesaid order on the ground that his grievance is to be redressed by the respondent no.2 i.e. Principal Secretary/Secretary, Department of Training & Technical Education, Govt. of NCTD, but not the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent i.e. Deputy Director of Education (North), Directorate of Education, GNCTD, as was directed by this Tribunal.

4. Since the applicant preferred a representation on 24.06.2016 to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent i.e. Deputy Director of Education (North), the OA was disposed of directing the concerned respondent to decide the said representation. Though one representation filed along with the O.A. was addressed to 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, but the request made there under is not the relief claimed in the O.A.

5. Hence, we do not find any merit in the RA, accordingly, the same is dismissed. However, if the applicant earlier made a representation to a wrong authority, this order shall not preclude him from making a fresh

representation to any other respondent including the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent, if he is so advised, and in such an event the said respondent may consider the same, in accordance with law. No costs.

**(V. Ajay Kumar)**  
**Member (J)**

/uma/