

19

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

RA No. 122/2003  
OA NO. 1617/2001

This the 18th day of September, 2003

HON'BLE SH. V.K. MAJOTRA, MEMBER (A)  
HON'BLE SH. KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER (J)

1. The Secretary,  
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting,  
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Director General,  
Doordarshan Kendra, Mandi House,  
New Delhi.
3. The Director,  
Doordarshan Kendra,  
Parliament Street, New Delhi.
4. Sh. Vijay Kumar Sharma,  
67 F Pocket I, Phase-II,  
Mayur Vihar, New Delhi (proforma party).
5. Sh. J.K.S. Chauhan,  
R/o Gadiid Suthereshah,  
Jamuna Bazar, Delhi.

(By Advocate: Sh. H.K. Gangwani)

Versus

Sh. Hari Om Dubey,  
27 D, DDA Flats,  
Chilla Village, Mayur Vihar Phase-I,  
New Delhi.

(By Advocate: Ms. Chetna Rao proxy for  
Sh. M.K. Bhardwaj)

O R D E R (ORAL)

By Sh. V.K. Majotra, Member (A)

Applicant has filed this RA stating therein that after the order is passed by this Tribunal, respondents had gone to the High Court in Writ Petition No. 757/2003. They have withdrawn the petition with liberty to file a review application before the Tribunal for rectification of mistake which is stated to have crept in the impugned order. The writ petition was withdrawn on 29.1.2003. Thereafter the present RA has been filed on 22.4.2003. In the application for condonation of delay in filing the review application it has

[ 2 ]

been stated that after withdrawing the writ petition the certified copy of the same was made available to him on 13.2.2003.

2. As to why the copy was made available on 13.2.2003 and ~~as~~ a photocopy of order dated 22.1.2002 has been placed on record. There is nothing to indicate as to when did the applicant apply for the certified copy of the Tribunal's order and when did it become available. Besides that it is pleaded in the application for condonation of delay that time was spent in obtaining the legal opinion for filing the review application and that there has been procedural delay in filing RA.

3. On going through the application for condonation of delay there is no explanation as to how long the file remained with the authority concerned to grant approval for filing the RA. Besides that we find that the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court shows that applicant had made a prayer that they want to take steps for rectification of their mistake crept in the impugned order. No mistake on face of record has been pointed out in the RA. Time taken in obtaining approval of the concerned authority for filing RA has also not been explained satisfactorily in the RA. Hence we find that RA is not only barred by time but also has no merits. It is accordingly dismissed.

( KULDIP SINGH )  
Member (J)

( V.K. MAJOTRA )  
Member (A)

'sd'