

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

RA 90/2001

in

OA 970/1999

32

New Delhi this the 27th day of February, 2001

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman(J).
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampl, Member(J).

Shri S.P. Pandey, IPS,
S/o Shri R.N. Pandey,
PHQ Bhopal,
R/o 13 Vaishali Kotra,
Sultanabad, Bhopal, MP.

Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through
Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block, New Delhi.

2. State of Madhya Pradesh,
through Secretary,
Ministry of Home
Police Department, Bhopal, (MP).

Respondents.

O R D E R (By Circulation)

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman(J).

The Review Application (RA 90/2001) has been filed by the applicant to review the order of the Tribunal dated 12.1.2001 in OA 970/1999.

2. We have carefully perused the grounds taken by the applicant, including the reasons given by the learned counsel for not appearing on the date when the case was listed for final hearing. In the first instance, it is clear from the averments made by the learned counsel for the applicant herself that she was aware that the case had been listed on 12.1.2001 and in the circumstances, the prayer for reviewing the order dated 12.1.2001 because of

82

her non-appearance can hardly be accepted as sufficient reasons.

33

3. None of the grounds taken by the applicant falls within the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, read with Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 to warrant allowing the R.A. It is further clear that by way of this Review Application, the applicant is trying to re-argue the case which cannot also be permitted (See the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Thungabhadra Industries Ltd. Vs. The Government of Andhra Pradesh** (AIR 1964 SC 1372) and **Meera Bhanja Vs. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury** (AIR 1995 SC 455)). RA 90/2001 is accordingly rejected.

(Govindan S. Tampi)
Member (A)

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman (J)

'SRD'