

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

35

R.A. No. 166 of 1996 in  
O.A./XXXX No. 2238/1994      Decided on: 2.12.1996

Dr. Pranvir Singh ....Applicant(s)

(By Shri \_\_\_\_\_ Advocate)

Versus

U.O.I. & Others ....Respondent(s)

(By Shri \_\_\_\_\_ Advocate)

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI

1. Whether to be referred to the Reporter or not?
2. Whether to be circulated to the other Benches of the Tribunal?

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A. No. 166 of 1996 In  
O.A. NO. 2238 of 1994

(36)

New Delhi this the 2nd day of December, 1996

**HON'BLE MR. K. MUTHUKUMAR, MEMBER (A)**

Dr. Pranvir Singh  
R/o Quarter No.48, Railway Colony,  
Tuglakabad,  
New Delhi-110 044. ....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Others

1. General Manager,  
Northern Railway,  
Baroda House,  
New Delhi-110 001.
2. Chief Medical Superintendent,  
Northern Railway,  
Divisional Hospital,  
Delhi.
3. Divisional Superintendent Engineer,  
(Estate),  
Northern Railway,  
New Delhi-110 001. ....Respondents

**ORDER BY CIRCULATION**

**Hon'ble Mr. K. Muthukumar, Member (A)**

This Review Application seeks to review the order passed in O.A. No. 2238 of 1994 decided on 8.7.1996.

2. On going through the Review Application, I find that the petitioner has not pointed out any error apparent on the face of the record but has tried to reagitate the same issues as in the

37

Original Application which is not permissible in the Review Application. In addition, he has pointed out that respondents have issued a letter dated 27.5.1996 and he submitted a copy of application stating the facts along with the copy of the letter dated 27.5.1996 in the court on 4.6.1996 so that the Bench may consider the same before pronouncing the judgement. I find that no such document is found on record. However, orders on the above case was finally heard on 30.4.1996 and the judgment was pronounced on 8.7.1996.

The petitioner has filed the above letter dated 27.5.96 along with the Review Application. On perusing this, I find that it is only a recommendation for regularisation of accommodation at 48, Railway Colony, Tughlakabad and charging of normal rent from 2.7.1993 to 20.05.1995 by the CMS, Delhi to D.S.E. (Estate), Northern Railway, New Delhi and this is not an order for regularisation of the quarter. The order passed in the O.A. does not call for any revision.

The Review Application is rejected.

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

RKS