

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

(P)

PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

R.A.No.156/97 and M.A.No.1497/97  
in O.A.No.1101/96

New Delhi, the 26th day of June, 1997.

CORAM:

HON'BLE SHRI A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

1. Union of India through  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
South Block, New Delhi.
2. Secretary,  
Defence Research & Development Organisation,  
Ministry of Defence,  
B-Wing, Sena Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110011.
3. Controller of Defence Accounts (R&D),  
L-Block Central Secretariat,  
New Delhi. ..Review Applicants

(By Advocate Mr.Syed Mohammad Arif, Addl.Standing Counsel)

vs.

Birendra Singh,  
Son of Late Shri R.E.Singh,  
R/o 780/II Sector-2, Sadiq Nagar,  
New Delhi.

..Respondent

O R D E R

HON'BLE SHRI A.V.HARIDASAN, VICE CHAIRMAN:

The prayer in this review application is for a review and modification of the final order passed in the Original Application on 10th December, 1996. Since the review application has been filed far beyond the time prescribed, M.A.No.1497/97 has been filed for having the delay condoned on the ground that due to administrative reasons, the review application could not be filed in time. In the order of the Tribunal which is sought to be reviewed, it was held that in the O.M. dated 7.8.89, no distinction has been made between a Central University and a State University and that the applicant who had resigned from the Sanjay Gandhi Post Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences, Lucknow, which is a University affiliated to the University Grants Commission, on 20.11.89 and joined the DRDO on 1.12.89, was covered by the

instructions contained in the O.M. dated 7.8.89. Stating that a contrary view was expressed by the University Grants Commission in a letter dated 15.4.1997 addressed to the Assistant Director(Personnel), Directorate of Personnel, Defence Research & Development Organisation and in the note dated 1.5.97 of the Department of Personnel & Training, the review applicants urge that the order is erroneous and has to be reviewed. The final order was passed by the Tribunal on the basis of the available material. A contrary view expressed by either the University Grants Commission or the Department of Personnel is not at all a ground for review of the order. Therefore, as there is no ground for review of the order, the review application is dismissed, although the delay in filing the review application can be condoned as it was occasioned only due to administrative delay. M.A.No.1497/97 is allowed, but the review application is rejected.



A.V.HARIDASAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN