

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

R.A. No. 183/2018 In
M.A. No.4145/2018 In
O.A. No. 3299/2014

Reserved On:05.10.2018

Pronounced on: 09.10.2018

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

Sh. Aashish Gupta,
Age 31 years
Group 'B'
S/o Sh. Durga Prasad,
Flat No.328, DDA (SFS), Hauz Khas Apartments,
Hauz Khas,
New Delhi-110016. Review Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri Asish Nischal)

Versus

1. Central Board of Excise and Customs
Through its Chairman,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Revenue,
North Block, New Delhi-110001
(Through its Chairman)
2. The Chief Commissioner of Central Excise,
C.R. Building, I.P. Estate, ITO,
New Delhi-110002.
3. The Chief Commissioner of Central Excise,
C.R. Building, Plot No.19, Sector-17C,
Chandigarh-160017. Respondents

ORDER

By Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)

The review applicant, who was selected and was allocated the post of Inspector, Central Excise, in pursuance of the Combined Graduate Leave Examination, 2012, filed the OA No.3299/2014

contending that the respondents No.1 to 3 have erred in allotment of Commissionerates, as they have not followed the directions issued by the recruiting agency, i.e. respondent No.4. This Tribunal, after hearing both sides, by its judgment dated 24.08.2015, dismissed the OA.

2. The RA No.277/2015 filed by the applicant was also dismissed on 02.05.2015, by this Tribunal. The W.P. (C) 6154/2016 filed by the applicant before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi against the orders of this Tribunal in the OA as well as of the RA, was also dismissed on 30.08.2016. The SLP No. 3859/2017 filed by the applicant before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India against the said orders, was also dismissed on 23.02.2017.

3. After the Review, W.P. and SLP filed against the order dated 24.08.2015 in OA No.3299/2014 were dismissed and after the said order was upheld upto the Hon'ble Apex Court, the review applicant filed the instant second Review Application No.183/2018 with MA No.4145/2018 seeking condonation of delay of 1128 days in filing the review.

4. Heard Shri Ashish Nischal, learned counsel for the review applicant.

5. The review applicant submits that since he received certain latest information under the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005, the order in the OA is required to be reviewed.

6. We do not find any merit in the MA seeking condonation of delay, as well as in the instant Review, accordingly, the same are dismissed. No costs.

(A.K. BISHNOI)
MEMBER (A)

(V. AJAY KUMAR)
MEMBER (J)

RKS