

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

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

New Delhi this the 28th 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 5th 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 5th 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 2nd 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 5th 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/