



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S. M. SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

REV.APLW No. 110 of 2026

1. The Union of India
Rep. b y its Secretary, Ministry of Railways
(Railway Board), New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,
Southern Railway, Chennai.
3. The Chief Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway, Chennai.
4. The Divisional Personnel Officer,
Southern Railway, Salem Division, Salem.


..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Registrar
Central Administrtive Tribunal, Madras Bench,
Chennai-600104.
2. A.Shaik Dawood
3. M.Mohammed Ibrahim
4. T.S.Balarajan
5. K.Rajendran
6. S.Oliver Kamalakaran,

..Respondent(s)

Review Application filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 of CPC r/w
Section 114 of CPC to review the order passed in WP No.27272 of 2011
dated 03.01.2018 as deemed fit necessary in the circumstances of the case



WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s): Ms.T.P.Savitha
Standing Counsel For Railway Counsel

For Respondent(s): Mr.Avinash Wadhwani
for Mrs.V.Srimathi for R2-6

ORDER**(Order of the Court was made by S.M.Subramaniam J.)**

Review Application has been instituted to review the order passed in WP.No.27272 of 2011 dated 03.01.2018.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the review petitioner, Union of India, Ministry of Railways would submit that post of Loco Pilot (Goods) and Loco Pilot (Passenger) presently carry identical scale of pay and the selection for Grade 1, which was a dispute raised before the Central Administrative Tribunal and before this Court, was cancelled by the Divisional office vide Proceedings, dated 19.10.2009. When the selection to the post of Loco Pilot (Passenger) Grade 1 was cancelled, the relief granted in the writ petition is unable to be implemented by the authorities. That apart, subsequently a fresh selection was notified and respondents/employees participated in the fresh selection and they were promoted.

3. Learned Senior Counsel would submit that though this fact was placed before the Tribunal and the Writ Court, it was not taken into consideration, which resulted in an error apparent. Cancellation of selection is a vital point, which is necessary and therefore, the present review petition is to



be considered.

WEB COPY

4. Learned counsel for the respondents/employees would submit that case is not only about selection but also about fixation of seniority. Fixation of seniority has not been done in accordance with the Rules. Therefore, the said issue is also to be decided.

5. In view of the fact that cancellation of selection process vide Proceedings, dated 19.10.2009 was not considered by the Court, despite the fact that it was placed by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and further, the said cancellation has got an impact on the issues, resulted in an error apparent which requires review of the order. However, the issues relating to the seniority is to be decided.

6. In view of the above position, writ order dated 03.01.2018 in WP No.27272 of 2011, dated 03.01.2018 is recalled and writ petition is restored on file.

7. Accordingly, the review application is allowed. No costs.

(S.M.S.,J.) (N.S.,J.)
18-06-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No


GD



To

1. The Registrar
Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench,
Chennai-600104.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

GD

REV.APLW No. 110 of 2026

18-06-2026