

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 170/00037/2017
IN
OA. No. 935/2014

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017

HON'BLE DR K.B. SURESH, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE SHRI P.K. PRADHAN, MEMBER(A)

1. The Union of India,
Represented by Secretary,
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation,
Sardar Patel Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Expenditure,
North Block, Loknayak Bhavan
New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Director General and Chief Executive Office,
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation,
Sardar Patel Bhavan,
Sansad Marg, New Delhi – 110 001.
4. The Additional Director General,
NSSO, DPD (Head Quarters)
No.164, GLT Road,
Mahalanobis Bhavan,
Kolkata – 700 108.
5. The Deputy Director General
NSSO, DPC
III Floor, 'F' Wing Kendriya Sadana,
Koramangala, Bangalore –34. ...Review Applicants

(By Shri.M.Swayam Prakash, Sr.Central Government Counsel)

Vs.

Miss Suparna Santra
#33, 3rd Floor, Balleappa Layout,
Koramangala Man Road,
Near Adugodi Signal,
Koramangala ,
Bangalore –560 0 34. ...Respondent.

(By Advocate Shri.Ranganatha S.Jois)

O R D E R (ORAL)HON'BLE DR K.B. SURESH, MEMBER(J)

In Review it is pointed out that in the earlier OA, which had been passed fundamental to this decision, they were working under plan post and these people were working under non-plan post and governance under Rules of business, there is no distinction between plan post and non-plan post. The allocation is the same. The only difference is that its budget, which is plan or non-plan are made subsequently. All has to go through the same parliament approval. There is no distinction or any difference between them. RA is wrong.

2. At this point, Shri Ranganath Jois, learned counsel for the original applicant says that all these people are also appointed in plan post and even otherwise also there is no distinction other than any non-plan allocation, the competitive authority already has given the approval. It is there in Annexure R-3, But without understanding the issue, the respondents have filed the Writ Petition unnecessarily and confused the martix.

3. Therefore, the RA is dismissed. No costs.

(P.K. PRADHAN)
MEMBER(A)

(DR. K.B.SURESH)
MEMBER(J)

vmr.

Annexures referred to by the Review applicants in RA.37/2017

Annexure RA-1: Copy of CAT order dated 1.4.2015 in A.No.935.2014.

Annexure RA-2: Copy of High Court order dated 2.8.2016 in WP. No.1837/2016.

Annexures referred to by the respondents

Annexure R1: Copy of the order made by CAT, Bangalore Bench in OA.No.339/2011.

Annexure R2: Copy of the order made by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP.No.57381/2013 (S-CAT) and WP.Nos. 8010-8035/2014 (S-CAT) dated 22.4.2014..

Annexure R3: Copy of the OM No.C-18013/11/2013-Ad.III dated 5.1.2015.

Annexure R4: Copy of the OM No.11012/11/2011-EG dated 19.12.2016.

.....