

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

RA No.78/2019
in
O.A No. 1345/2013

New Delhi, this the 25th day of March, 2019

Hon'ble Mr. V. Ajay Kumar, Member (J)
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)

G.K. Singh, age about 52 years,
S/o Sh. S.C. Singh,
Assistant Director (Litigation) Grade-I,
O/o Erstwhile Director General of
Supplies and Disposal
Department of Commerce, (Supply Division)
Jeevan Tara Building, 5, Parliament Street,
New Delhi – 110 001.Review Applicant

Versus

Union of India, through

1. The Secretary,
Ministry of Commerce & Industries,
Department of Commerce (Supply Division),
Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi – 110 011.
2. Finance Secretary,
Government of India,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Expenditure,
North Block, New Delhi – 110 001.
3. Director (Administration),
Supply Division
O/o Erstwhile Director General of
Supplies and Disposal
Department of Commerce, (Supply Division)
Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-110 011.
4. Under Secretary (Estt.),
Room No.230, C-Wing, Supply Division,
Department of Commerce,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110 011.Respondents

ORDER (In Circulation)

By Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A):

The review applicant has sought review of the Tribunal's order dated 13.02.2019 by which OA No.1345/2013 was dismissed.

2. The matter pertains to grant of promotion to the post of Dy. Director (Litigation) in DGS&D and the OA was dismissed on the admitted fact that since the Department of DG (S&D) has itself been abolished, no case is made out for promotion of the applicant. It is also not the case of the applicant that he is on the roads as he is working under DoP&T in the Surplus Staff Establishment Cell of Ministry of Department of Commerce and would be redeployed at an appropriate time. These facts have not been contested by the applicant in this review application.

3. The *sina quo non* for reviewing the order of the Tribunal is an error apparent on the face of the record which the review applicant has failed to show. None of the points urged by the applicant were omitted from consideration.

4. We do not find any ground to entertain the review petition. The same is accordingly rejected, in circulation.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(V. Ajay Kumar)
Member (J)

/Ahuja/