

(5)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A.No.58/99 with M.A.No. 473/99

IN

NEW DELHI. 6.5.99.

O.A.No.1427/94

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

HON'BLE MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)

Govt. of NCT,
through Chief Secretary,
5, Shyam Nath Marg,
Delhi.

2. Commissioner of Police,
Police Headquarters,
MSO Building, IP Estate,
New Delhi.

3. Addl. Commissioner of Police,
South Range, Police Headquarters,
MSO Building, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi.

4. Deputy Commissioner of Police,
South West District, Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi

..... Review
applicants.

(By Advocate: Shri Vijay Pandita)

Versus

1. Munishwar Dayal,
S/o Sh. Kali Charan,
R/o Village and P.O Naniula,
Distt. Meerut (UP)

2. Kartar Singh,
S/o Shri Jiwan Singh,
R/o Village and PO Rithala,
Delhi-110 085

..... Review respondents/
original applicants.

(By Advocate: Shri G. D. Gupta)

ORDER

BY HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

We have heard review applicants (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) counsel Shri Vijay Pandita on RA No. 58/99 seeking review of the Tribunal's order dated 1.12.94 in O.A.No.1427/94. Shri G. D. Gupta who had represented the applicants in that OA (review respondents in the present RA) was also present.

(b)

2. At the outset we note that the RA is grossly time barred and squarely hit by Rule 17 (1) CAT(Procedure) Rules. MA No. 473/99 has been filed for condonation of delay in which it has been contended that various orders have been passed after the impugned order dated 1.12.94 on the basis of which the impugned order requires to be reviewed.

3. Much the same arguments have been advanced in the RA itself and particular reliance has been placed on the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment in State of Rajasthan Vs. B.K.Meena JT 1996(6) SCC 417 and M.Y.Miya's case 1997(2) SCC 699.

4. It is well settled that the grounds taken in an RA have to fall within the scope and ambit of Section 22(3)(f) A.T. Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC under which alone any order/decision of the Tribunal can be reviewed. Order and judgments delivered much after the date of the impugned order cannot be advanced as a ground to justify review.

5. The RA is rejected.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)

MEMBER(J)

S. R. Adige
(S. R. ADIGE)
VICE CHAIRMAN (A).

/ug/