

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

(X)

RA-269/95

with

MA-2508, 2509 & 2510/95 in

Q.A-463/94

New Delhi this the 1st Day of ~~February~~^{March}, 1996.

(B)

Hon'ble Sh. B. K. Singh, Member (A)
Hon'ble Dr. A. Vedavalli, Member (J)

1. National Capital Territory of Delhi
(through its Chief Secretary)
5, Sham Nath Marg, Delhi-110 006.
2. The Director of Education,
Delhi State, Old Sectt.,
Delhi-110 006.
3. The Dy. Director of Education,
Distt. Central, Bola Road,
Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110 002. Review Applicants
(through Sh. B.S. Gupta, advocate)

versus

Smt. Sunita,
W/o Sh. Mukesh Kumar,
R/o House No.250, Gali No.13,
Than Singh Nagar, Anand Parbat,
New Delhi-110 005.

Respondent in RA

(through Sh. B.L. Babbar, advocate)

ORDER

delivered by Hon'ble Sh. B.K. Singh, Member (A)

This review application No.269/95 alongwith
MA-2508, 2509 & 2510/95 have been filed against
the judgement/order in Q.A.No.463/94. The judgement
was delivered by a.D.B. comprising Hon'ble Mr.
Justice S.K. Dhaon, then Vice-Chairman and myself.
The application was allowed and the impugned order
of non-appointment of the applicant in the Q.A. was
quashed and set aside. The judgement was delivered
on 25.11.94 and according to the version of the
review applicant i.e. N.C.T. of Delhi a copy of the
judgement was delivered to them on 21.12.94. The
present review application was filed on 25.9.95.

(B)

(3)

Rule 17 of the C.A.T. (Procedure) Rules, 1987
sub-para(i) lays down : "No application for review
shall be entertained unless it is filed within
thirty days from the date of receipt of copy of
the order sought to be reviewed." It is evident
that this review application has been filed after
9 months from the date of delivery of the judgement.
The additional-affidavit was filed on 16.1.96 since
the previous affidavit filed on the subject did not
show sufficient and reasonable cause for condonation
of delay. In this additional-affidavit also the
delay has not been satisfactorily explained. It
refers to the movement of the file from one section
to other and from one officer to the other and mentions
the advice of the then standing counsel Sh. Surat Singh
not to go in for a review. It is also stated that
the orders have since been implemented and the applicant
in the O.A. has been appointed. It has further been
stated that the applicant has been granted appointment
subject to the final out-come of the S.L.P. as and when
filed by the Education Department in Hon'ble Supreme
Court. The judgement is based on the interpretation
given by a D.B. of the Tribunal and if the respondents
have any grievance, they are at liberty to move an
S.L.P. before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. No review
is permissible for fresh hearing on the subject.
Without entering into the merits of the R.A., we
are not inclined to condone the delay since we do
not find substantial and reasonable cause to do so.

A. Vedavalli
(Dr. A. Vedavalli) 13/96
M(J)

(B. K. Singh)
M(A)

/vv/

(B)