

11.

29.09.2006

(51)

MA-1296/2006
RA-87/2005
OA-1606/1998

Present: Ms. Nidhi Bisaria, learned proxy counsel for Shri V.K. Rao, for
Applicant in MA-1296/2006

Respondents have now filed MA-1296/2006 seeking clarification of order
dated 06.12.2005.

Perusal of the order sheet shows that after notice was issued in R.A,
respondents took four adjournments to file reply but finally on 6.12.2005. Shri
V.K. Rao who represented all the respondents stated he has no objection if RA
is allowed. It was, therefore, specifically noted in Paragraph-2 as follows:

"Counsel for respondents appeared and stated that he has no
objection if the prayers made by the applicants in the RA are
allowed".

Thus, a consent order was passed on 06.12.2005.

Apart from it, rule 17(4) of CAT Procedure Rules makes it clear that when
an application for review of any judgments or orders has been made and
disposed of, no further application for review shall be entertained in the same
matter.

In view of above, it is not open to the respondents now to file an
application seeking clarification/modification of the above said order. MA is not
maintainable. The same is accordingly dismissed.


(Mrs. Meera Chhibber)
Member (J)

cc.


(V.K. Majotra)
Vice Chairman (A)

for MM (C) 10/10/2006
WTF offical
R.M.