

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**RA No. 4/2018
OA No. 2390/2010**

New Delhi this the 30th day of August, 2019

Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)

1. Union of India
Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
 2. The Director General Doordarshan,
Doordarshan Bhawan,
Copernicus, Marg, New Delhi
 3. The Deputy Director (Admn.)
Doordarshan, Doordarshan Bhawan,
Copernicus Marg, New Delhi
 4. Director Doordarshan Kendra,
Thaltej Ahmedabad
 5. Director,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Aji Darn Road Rajkot
- Review Applicants

(By Advocate: Ms. Vertika Sharma)

Versus

1. Zakir H. Pathan,
S/o Sh. Haroon Rashid Pathan,
Working as Production Assistant,
Doordarshan Kendra, Jagalpur (CG)
2. Roshan Somkuwar
S/o Sh. Bapu Rao
Working as Production Assistant,
Doordarshan Kendra, Nagpur(MS)
3. Niranjana Pathak,
S/o Sh. Arvind
Working as Production Assistant,
Doordarshan Kendra, Nagpur(MS)
4. Umakant Waratkar,
S/o Sh. Waman Rao,
Working as Production Assistant,

Doordarshan Kendra, Nagpur (MS)

- Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. Yogesh Sharma)

ORDER (ORAL)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury:

At the outset, Ms. Vertika Sharma, learned counsel for the review applicants, has fairly submitted that a similar RA No. 2/2018 filed against the same common order dated 15.11.2015, which was also challenged by them in the present RA No. 4/2018 was dismissed by the Tribunal vide its order dated 16.04.2019 with the following observations:-

“At the outset, counsel for the original applicants has put before us a copy of the Writ Petition (Civil) No. 9025/2015 which has been decided on 16.01.2018. He has been able to show that this judgment was passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi after considering in detail the similar contentions as have been raised by the present review applicants and as such, is squarely applicable to the present RA. In this judgment, the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi has held as under:-

“10. We have heard counsel for the applicants and do not find any ground to review our order dated 27th January, 2017. Counsel for the applicants has stated that there will be several other employees, about 600 in number, who would be entitled to similar benefits. We have not decided the other cases. In case there are similar claims by third parties, it will be open to the applicants to take the plea of limitation, etc. Accordingly, the relief can be moderated. The next submission is that the applicants have passed an order dated 24th November, 2017 whereby the terminated re-engaged, Production Assistants, who were given fresh appointment on 6th January, 1994, have been given back dated seniority by counting their service and appointment from 1984. Application for additional documents, is to place this order, passed after decision dated 27th January, 2017, on record. We do not think that the applicants vide the said order can obliterate the orders passed by the Tribunal in OA No. 1191/2001, decided on 7th May, 2002 or the order dated 18th January, 2008 passed in OA No. 1653/2007, which direction upon consideration by the applicants had resulted in stepping up of the pay of the petitioners in OA No. 1653/2007. Directions given by the Tribunal which have attained finality and have

been implemented cannot be unwritten and erased, in this manner. Neither can our decision dated 27th January, 2017, be effaced and obliterated.”

2. In view of the above, we dismiss this RA in terms of the aforesaid judgment dated 16.01.2018 in WP(C) No. 9025/2015.”

2. In view of the above, the present RA is also dismissed in terms of the order dated 16.04.2019 passed in similar RA No. 2/2018. No order as to costs.

(S.N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/lg/