

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**R.A. No.209/2017 in
O.A. No. 15/2013
with
R.A. No.210/2017 in
O.A. No. 16/2013
and
R.A. No.211/2017 in
O.A. No. 17/2013**

New Delhi, this the 23rd day of September, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

R.A. No.209/2017 in O.A. No.15/2013

1. Shri Laxman
S/o Shri Ram Sarup
Working as Asstt. Binder
Under Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana)
 2. Miss Ashmi Baby
D/o Shri C.C. Baby
Working as Asstt. Binder
Under Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana).
 3. Shri Deepak Arora
S/o Shri Dharam Pal Arora
Working as Asstt. Binder
Under Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana).
 4. Shri Deepak Arora
S/o Shri Satish Chander
Working as Asstt. Binder
Under Govt. of India Press
Faridabad.
- ... Applicants/
Respondents in RA

(By Advocate: Shri Manjeet Singh Reen for Shri Ajesh
Luthra)

Versus

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Urban Development &
Poverty Alleviation
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Director
Directorate of Printing
Govt. of India Press
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Manager
Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana). ... Respondents/
Review Applicants

(By Advocate: Dr. Ch. Shamsuddin Khan)

R.A. No.210/2017 in O.A. No. 16/2013

Shri Narender Kumar
S/o Shri Sudershan Kumar
Working as Asstt. Binder
Under Govt. of India Press
Faridabad. ... Applicant/
Respondent in RA

(By Advocate: Shri Manjeet Singh Reen)

Versus

Union of India & Others, through

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Urban Development &
Poverty Alleviation
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Director
Directorate of Printing

Govt. of India Press
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.

3. The Manager
Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana). ... Respondents
Review Applicants

(By Advocate: Dr. Ch. Shamsuddin Khan)

R.A. No.211/2017 in O.A. No. 17/2013

Shri Satish Chand
S/o Shri Ramesh Chand
Working as Asstt. Binder
Faridabad.

... Applicant/
Respondent in RA

(By Advocate: Shri Manjeet Singh Reen)

Versus

Union of India & Others, through

1. The Secretary
Ministry of Urban Development &
Poverty Alleviation
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.
2. The Director
Directorate of Printing
Govt. of India Press
Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi – 110 001.
3. The Manager
Govt. of India Press
Faridabad (Haryana). ... Respondents/
Review Applicants

(By Advocate: Dr. Ch. Shamsuddin Khan)

O R D E R (ORAL)**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman**

These three Review Applications (RAs) are similar in nature. Hence, they are heard together and disposed of by this common order.

2. O.A. Nos.15/2013 and 16/2013 were heard together and allowed through the common order dated 02.12.2016. O.A. No.17/2013 filed by the similar applicant was allowed on 21.02.2017, following the common order in O.A. Nos. 15/2013 and 16/2013. The RAs are filed by the respondents in O.A. Nos. 15/2013, 16/2013 and 17/2013.

3. O.A. Nos. 15/2013 and 16/2013 were filed by the Assistant Binders in the Govt. of India Press, Faridabad, feeling aggrieved by the action of the respondents in disturbing their position in the seniority. The plea of the respondents was that the said disturbance became inevitable on account of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP(C) No.26/2009 and Contempt Case No.224/2011. The Tribunal took note of the purport of the orders in the Writ Petition and Contempt Case. It

was observed that they are totally unrelated to the Unreserved vacancies. Accordingly, the OAs were allowed and the orders impugned therein were set aside. These RAs are filed by the respondents in the OAs, with a prayer to review the orders passed in the respective OAs. The grounds pleaded are mostly, those taken in the OAs.

3. We heard Dr. Ch. Shamsuddin Khan, learned counsel for the review applicants/respondents in the OAs and Shri Manjeet Singh Reen, learned counsel for the respondents/applicants in the OAs.

4. In the orders passed in the OAs., every minute aspect presented by the parties as well as the purport of various orders, passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and this Tribunal, were taken into account. The review applicants are not able to point out that any error of law or patent mistake of fact, has crept into the orders of the OAs. We, therefore, dismiss the RAs. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

/jyoti/