

11

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,  
NEW DELHI.

R.A.No.184/95 & M.A.No.1837/95.

IN

O.A.No.2024/94

New Delhi: September 21, 1995.

HON'BLE MR. S.R.ADIGE, MEMBER(A)

Shri Puran Singh Arya ..... Applicant in  
Applicant in person. O.A.2024/94 (Respondents  
in Review  
application)  
Vs.  
Directorate of Education & others ... Review applicants  
By Advocate Shri Arun Bhardwaj. (Respondents in  
O.A. 2024/94)

ORDER (ORAL)

Both sides have been heard. Shri Bhardwaj  
has pressed R.A.No.184/95, praying for review  
of the Tribunal's judgment dated 25.4.95 in O.A.  
No.2024/94 P.S.Arya Vs. UOI.

2. M.A.1837/95 in R.A.184/95 has also  
been filed praying for condonation of delay in  
filing the R.A.

3. Shortly stated the case of the review  
applicant (Respondents in O.A.2024/94) is firstly  
that the figure Rs.20,460/-, which has been  
directed to be paid to the applicant Shri P.S.Arya  
should actually read as Rs.20,459/-; Secondly it has  
been urged that Shri Arya is not entitled to  
interest @ 12% p.a. for the period 1.7.91 onwards which  
the Tribunal has directed to be paid to him in the  
impugned judgment; Thirdly it has been urged that the  
arrears are only in respect of stepping of pay, and  
not in respect of revised calculation of DCRG, gratuity  
etc. which have already been paid in full.

A

12

4. In so far as the first point is concerned, it does appear that the figure Rs.20,460/- should actually read Rs.20,459/- because in paragraph 2 of Tribunal's judgment, it has been stated that the respondents are now arranging to pay the arrears of Rs.20,550/- less Rs.91/- which comes to Rs.20,459/-. The Tribunal's judgment dated 25.4.95 should be modified in paragraph 4 thereof.

5. In so far as the second point regarding payment of interest @ 12% p.a. for the period 1.7.91 onwards is concerned, it is well settled that the scope and ambit of a review petition has to be strictly limited and confined to the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC under which alone any decision/judgment/order of the Tribunal can be reviewed. A plain reading of the impugned judgment makes it abundantly clear that none of the ingredients of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC are satisfied as far as this point is concerned, and the Tribunal's direction to the respondents to pay interest @ 12% p.a. from 1.7.91 onwards cannot be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record. That being the position, that direction cannot be questioned in an R.A.

6. In so far as the third point that the arrears are only in respect of stepping of pay, and not in respect of revised calculation of DCRG, gratuity etc. is concerned, the submissions made by Shri Bhardwaj are noted.

7. This O.A. accordingly stands disposed of and the applicants in the RA (respondents in O.A.) are directed to make payment to Shri P.S.Arya in accordance with the Tribunal's judgment dated

^

✓  
(13)

25.4.95 as marginally modified by the contents of  
para 4 above positively within 2 months from the  
date of receipt of a copy of this order.

*Myelige*  
( S.R. ADIGE )  
MEMBER (A).

/ug/