

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

R.A. No.123/2014 in  
O.A. No.668/2013  
CP No.218/2014  
MA No.1896/2014

New Delhi this the 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2015

Hon'ble Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Member (A)  
Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bhardwaj, Member (J)

**RA No.123/2014**

The Director  
National Gallery of Modern Art  
Jaipur House, New Delhi-110 003. -Review Applicant.

(By Advocate: Shri H.K.Gangwani)

versus

Mahajabeen Akhtar  
Daughter of Late Ranaq Ali Siddiqui  
1478, Ajmal Khan Street  
Ballil Maran, Delhi-110006. -Respondent.

(By Advocate: Ms.Harvinder Oberoi)

**CP No.218/2014**

Mahajabeen Akhtar  
Daughter of Late Ranaq Ali Siddiqui  
1478, Ajmal Khan Street  
Ballil Maran, Delhi-110006. -Petitioner.

(By Advocate: Ms.Harvinder Oberoi)

versus

1. Shr. Ravinver Singh, IAS,  
Secretary, Ministry of Culture,  
502, C-Wing, Shastri Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110003.

2. Sh. Prof. Rajiv Lochan,  
The Director  
National Gallery of Modern Art  
Jaipur House, New Delhi-110 003. -Respondents  
(By Advocate: Shri H.K.Gangwani)  
(RA No.123/2014)  
(2)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Per Sudhir Kumar, Member (A):**

**RA No.123/2014**

After having heard the learned counsel for both sides, it transpires that the applicant was initially appointed as a Technical Assistant on 22.11.1978 on temporary basis, and subsequently, she had been appointed in substantive capacity in that Technical Assistant Post with effect from 04.06.1981. This order dated 17.06.1981, which had not been filed by her in OA No.668/2013, has been produced by her today, during the course of the arguments.

2. Learned counsel for the review applicants/respondents in OA has pointed out that apart from all other grounds raised by them in their Review Application, this one single document itself would change the complexion and colour of the conclusions and the final order, which were arrived at earlier by the Bench, while deciding the OA on 22.05.2014.

3. Therefore, the R.A. is allowed, and the order dated 25.02.2014 passed in MA No.905/2013 in RA No.69/2013 in OA No.799/2009 with OA No.668/2013 25.02.2014 is recalled.

4. Let the matter in MA No.905/2013 (supra) be listed for fresh hearing on 30.09.2015.

**CP No.218/2014**

In view of the aforementioned order, whereby RA No.123/2014 has been allowed, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present Contempt Petition. Permitted. The Contempt Petition is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. Notices issued earlier are discharged.

(A.K. Bhardwaj)  
Member (J)

(Sudhir Kumar)  
Member (A)

/kdr/