

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.

R.A. No. 205 of 1995 In  
O.A./T.A. No. 43 of 1994      Decided on: 22/5/96

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

(By Shri V.S.R. Krishna Advocate)

Versus

Smt. Gangotri Devi ....Respondent(s)

(By Shri A.K. Bhardwaj Advocate)

CORAM:

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

THE HON'BLE SHRI

1. Whether to be referred to the Reporter  
or not? } 1/2

2. Whether to be circulated to the other  
Benches of the Tribunal? } 2/2

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)

MEMBER (A)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A. No. 205 of 1995 In  
O.A. No. 43 of 1994

21<sup>st</sup>

New Delhi this the 17th day of May, 1996

(15)

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

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Defence Production, Central Secretariat, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Ordnance Factories, 10, Auckland Road, Calcutta.
3. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Muradnagar, Dt. Ghaziabad, U.P.-201206. ... Review Applicants

By Advocate Shri V.S. R. Krishna

versus

Smt. Gangotri Devi  
W/o late Shri Sheshnath Singh,  
R/o S-505, School Block,  
Shakurpur,  
New Delhi. ... Respondent

By Advocate Shri A.K. Bhardwaj

ORDER

This Review Application seeks to review the judgment in O.A. No. 43 of 1995 decided on 5.7.1994. The Review Application was filed on 31.8.1994 and is barred by limitation and is liable to be rejected on this ground alone.

2. A Review application lies only to correct apparent error or omission on the face of the record. The review applicants contend that the judgement rendered in the aforesaid O.A.

(16)

was not in consonance with the Executive Instructions issued on the subject of compassionate appointment. In the aforesaid order passed by the Tribunal, the respondents were directed to reconsider the case of the applicant in the O.A. on the facts other than that of the terminal benefits and pension that is being given to the applicant and pass a speaking order. The applicants in the Review Application contends that while rejecting the respondent's request for compassionate appointment, the review applicants had already taken all the facts into account including the terminal benefits and pension that was granted to the respondent and, therefore, there is no error in the order inasmuch as it directs the review applicants to consider all other facts other than the terminal benefits and pension whereas the review applicants had to take into account the terminal benefits and pension in terms of the Executive Instructions on the subject.

3. If the applicants in the review ~~are~~ aggrieved about the correctness of the judgment, it was open to them to prefer an appeal against the aforesaid order. There is no error or omission apparent in the order.

4. There is no merit in the Review Application and it is accordingly rejected.

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

RKS