

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

RA No. 59/2005  
MA No. 1444/2004  
IN  
OA No. 2570/2001

*A*  
Review Application No. 59/2005 has been filed against order dated 03.02.2005 passed in MA No. 1444/2004 by a Single Bench comprising of Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, Member(A).

*B*  
Original Application No. 2570/2001 has already been disposed of on 15.05.2002 by a Single Bench comprising of Hon'ble Mr. Kuldip Singh Member(J) (as he then was, now HVC(J) at Jodhpur Bench)

Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, Member(A) is a Member of the Allahabad Bench of the Tribunal.

In view of the above Review Application may be sent to the Registrar Allahabad Bench for placing the same before Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, Member(A) by circulation in the first instance as provided by Appendix-IV para II (b) of CAT Rules of Practice, 1993.

*T.S. Sandhu*  
(T.S. SANDHU)  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR(JUDL.)  
04.04.2005

JOINT REGISTRAR

*5/4/05*

PRINCIPAL REGISTRAR

*6/4/05*

HON'BLE CHAIRMAN

*18 Aug 7.4*

*5367/CDH/05*  
*6/4*  
*Mr. Justice*

*15*  
*20/4/05*  
*20/4/05*

*20/4/05*  
*11/4/05*

*15/4/05*  
*12/4/05*

By Circulation

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI**

Review Application No. 59 of 2005.

IN

M.A. No. of 1444 of 2004.

IN

O.A. No. 2570 of 2001

ALLAHABAD THIS THE 26th DAY OF MAY 2005.

**Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, Member (A)**

1. Smt. Aruna Devi w/o late Kunwar Pal Singh
2. Shri Indresh Rao S/o late Shri Kunwar Pal Singh  
Ex-Train Mail Peon Neoli Distt-Etah, R/o  
Mohalla Gandhi Nagar (Jatavpura) Etah.

.....Applicants.

*(By Advocate: Sri D.P. Sharma)*

Versus.

1. Union of India  
Through Secretary  
Ministry of Communication  
Department of Posts  
Dak Bhawan- Sansad Marg  
New Delhi.
2. The Chief Postmaster General  
U.P. Circle, Lucknow.
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Etah Division- Etah.

*(By Advocate: Sri )*

.....Respondents.

**O R D E R**

This Review application has been filed against  
the order of this Tribunal in M.A. No. 1444/04 in

*D.R. Tiwari*

2.

O.A. No. 2570 of 2001. I have gone through the review application in question. The settled legal position is that review is not an appeal in disguise. I do not find any error apparent in this order. Review is not a routine procedure. In case, the applicant is aggrieved by the order, he may go in for appeal or revision or file a writ.

2. In view of the above, the review application is devoid of merits and it merits rejection.

*Dinesh* -  
Member-A

/Manish/