

(1)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No. 41/2004 in  
MA No. 193/2004 In  
O.A. No. 2109/2002

New Delhi, this the 5<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Union of India & Ors.

-Applicants

-Versus-

Sukhpal & Others

-Respondents

O R D E R (BY CIRCULATION)

The present RA is filed by the review applicants, seeking review of my order dated 14.10.2003 passed in OA No. 2109/2002.

2. Review applicants have also filed MA NO. 193/2004 seeking condonation of delay in filing the RA. I have perused the grounds taken in the MA which are not sufficient to condone the delay. Hence, the MA is rejected.

3. However, in the interest of justice, I have also perused my order dated 14.10.2003 as also the review application and do not find any error apparent on the face of the record or discovery of new material which was not available with the review applicants despite due diligence at the time of final hearing. If the review applicants are not satisfied with the order passed by the Tribunal remedy lies elsewhere. By way of this RA they wish to re-argue the case, which is not permissible in terms of the provisions of Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Order XLVII, Rule (1) of CPC.

and also in view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in K. Ait Babu & Others v. Union of India & Others, JT 1997 (7) SC 24. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed, in circulation.

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju) :  
Member (J)

'San..'