

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

R.A. NO. 196/2003 IN OA 59/99  
MA 1451, 1452, 1453 & 1454/2003

NEW DELHI THIS 17<sup>th</sup> DAY OF JULY 2003

HON'BLE SHRI GOVINDAN S. TAMPI, MEMBER (A)

Union of India & Others: Petitioners

VERSUS

Vinod S/o Sh Balbir Singh,  
A-1/269 Paschim Vihar,  
Rohtak Road, New Delhi,

..... Respondent

ORDER

R.A. No. 196/2003 filed by respondents (Min. of Defence and Others) seeking recall and review of my combined order dated 04/02/2003, disposing of 07 OAs No.49,54,58, 59, 71,72 and 261 of 1999. MA Nos. 1451, 1452, 1453 & 1954/2003 which have been filed for rectifying mistakes are allowed in the interest of justice.

2. All the above OAs were disposed of as below:

"In the above view of the matter, all the above OAs succeed substantially and are accordingly allowed. The respondents are directed to consider reinstatement of the applicants and the regularisation in service, in terms of the conditions as laid down in their own Model Standing Order dated 15.12.1989 and letter dated 31.1.1991, as directed by the Hon'ble High Court, ahead of those juniors who have been regularised. The respondents shall also count the previous service rendered by the applicants for the purposes of seniority, but the applicant would not be entitled for any back-wages for the period between the dates of their disengagement and reinstatement. The above exercise shall be completed within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. "

- 2 -

2. On examination of present RA I find that the same seeks to re-argue on merits all the points which have been examined and decided upon. This is not a case where any error apparent on record is brought out and what is sought to be reviewed is the interpretation arrived at by the Tribunal while giving the decision. Merely because the respondents are not happy with the result a review of the order cannot be undertaken. If the review applicants (originally respondents) are aggrieved by the line adopted by the Tribunal in interpreting the law and instructions the remedy lies elsewhere and not in review. The matter which has now being agitated falls outside the scope of review as provided in Section 22(3) (b) of the AT Act 1985. Such attempted reviews are also frowned upon by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Avtar Singh Sekhon Vs UOI & Others[ 1980 SC 2041). I am convinced in the above circumstances, that the RA has no merit. It is accordingly rejected .

(Govindan S. Tampl)  
Member (A)

Patwal/