

(4)

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

R.A. No. 16 of 1999  
M.A. No. 97 of 1999  
in  
O.A. No. 873 of 1996

New Delhi, dated this the 5th April 1999

Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)  
Hon'ble Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

In the matter of:

**A.S. Raza Vs. Union of India & Ors.**

Union of India & Ors. ... Review Applicants

Versus

A.S. Raza ... Rev. Respondent

ORDER (By Circulation)

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

Perused the R.A.

2. At the outset it is noticed that the R.A. has been filed with great delay and is squarely hit by Rule 17 CAT Procedure Rules.

3. M.A. No. 97/99 has been filed for condonation of delay in which it has been stated that after receipt of the certified copy of the impugned order of the Tribunal dated 3.6.98, respondents came to know of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's decision in the case of State of Rajasthan Vs. B.K. Meena & Ors. reported in JT 1996 (8) SC 684 and after taking legal advice decided to file this R.A.

4. The impugned order dated 3.6.96 was passed in the presence and with the consent of both parties, and the aforesaid ground advanced by

7

5

(2)

respondents cannot be considered a good ground to condone the delay in filing this R.A., because in Bhoop Singh Vs. UOI JT 1992 (3) SC 322 the Hon'ble Supreme Court have themselves held that judgments and orders of the Court in other cases do not extend the limitation period, which in this case was 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the impugned order dated 3.6.98, vide Rule 17 CAT (Procedure) Rules.

5. The scope and ambit of a review application is severely limited and has to fall within the parameters of Section 22(3)(f) A.T. Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. A perusal of the grounds taken in the R.A. makes it clear that it does not fall within the parameters defined above.

6. The R.A. is rejected.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*

(Mrs. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)

*S.R. Adige*

(S.R. Adige)  
Vice Chairman (A)

/GK/