

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench

RA 220/2001
in
OA 2367/1999

19

New Delhi this the 29th day of May, 2001

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

1. Union of India through
the Director,
Department of Posts, Dak Tar Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief Post Master General,
Delhi Circle, Meghdut Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. The S. Supdt. of Post Office,
Delhi North Dvosopm.
Civil Lines, Delhi.
4. The Asstt. Supdt. of Post Office,
Delhi North IIIrd Division,
Rohini Post Office, Delhi-85. ... Review
Applicants.

Versus

Virender Singh
S/o Shri Bal Singh,
R/o RZ L-18, Roshanpura,
Najafgarh,
New Delhi-43. ... Respondent.

O R D E R (By Circulation)

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

This Review Application has been filed by the Union of India and Others, praying for review of the Tribunal's order dated 18.7.2000 in OA 2367/99. They have also filed MA 1088/2001, praying for condonation of delay in filing the Review Application.

2. The review applicants have relied on the Full Bench judgement of the Tribunal dated 19-20 April, 2000 in

19/


20

D.M. Nagesh & Ors. Vs. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Office, Bangalore South, Bangalore and Ors. (Annexure A-2). They have submitted that this order was not within their knowledge at the time of passing the order dated 18.7.2000, which ^{is} they would now like to rely on ^{it} by way of the Review Application, which they have belatedly filed on 31.1.2001.

3. The grounds taken in MA 1088/2001 cannot be considered as sufficient grounds to condone the delay of several months in filing the Review Application. They have not even cared to mention as to when they became aware of the Tribunal's order dated 19/20.4.2000 in D.M. Nagesh's case (supra).

4. In para 5 of the order dated 18.7.2000 in OA 2367/99, the O.A. has been disposed of with a direction to the respondents that in case the applicant applies against any future vacancy that may arise, they should keep in view his past service rendered as ED Packer for considering him for employment in any suitable capacity, in accordance with the rules and instructions. Having regard to this order, we are unable to agree with the contentions of the review applicants that this is a fit case to allow the Review Application.

5. For the reasons given above, RA 220/2001 and MA 1088/2001 in OA 2367/99 are rejected.


(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Vice Chairman(J)