

(12)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

M.A. Nos. 738, 739 and 740 of 1996 In

R.A. No. 63 of 1996 In

O.A. No. 1923 of 1994

New Delhi this the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 1996

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

Union of India through

1. The General Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Church Gate,  
Bombay.
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,  
Western Railway,  
Jaipur.
3. The Assistant Engineer,  
Western Railway,  
Bandidhud.  
(Rajasthan).

...Petitioners in the RA/  
Respondents in the OA

Versus

1. Smt. Vidyawati  
W/o Sher Singh
  2. Bhim Singh  
Brother of Late Shri Sher Singh  
R/o Village Shawadi  
P.O. Bidwana  
District Rewari (Haryana).
- ...Respondents/Applicants  
in the O.A.

ORDER BY CIRCULATION

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

The petitioners in this Review Application who were the respondents in the O.A. No. 1923 of 1994, have filed this Review application seeking to review the order dated 31.8.1995 passed on the aforesaid O.A. In the aforesaid O.A., the respondents were directed

13

to issue appropriate orders for grant of family pension after verification of the date given in the document by the applicants in the rejoinder within a period of three months from the date of issue of the order if applicant No.1 is found eligible for the grant of family pension. The review petitioners submit that the Tribunal had relied on the letter dated 14.9.1990 along with the seniority list filed as Annexure -13 to the rejoinder and they submit that the aforesaid document is not traceable in the file of the respondents and it has now been verified that the deceased was initially engaged on 30.09.1982 but he became a regular employee much after temporary status was granted to him on 1.1.1984. It is also averred that the O.A. suffers from misjoinder of parties and the respondents, Chief Project Manager (Construction) was not impleaded as one of the respondents. The above facts do not disclose any error apparent on the fact of the record in the order. All that the order directs is that the respondents should issue appropriate orders after verification of the date given in the document as given in the rejoinder if applicant No.1 is found eligible for the grant of family pension.

2. In the light of this, there is no merit in the Review Application and the same is accordingly rejected.

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

RKS