

10

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A. No.37 of 1997
in
O.A. No. 272 of 1996

New Delhi, dated the 17th February, 1997

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, M(A)
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, M(J)

Shri Bikram Singh,
S/o late Shri Mahender Singh,
L.D.C.
O/o the Director,
Defence Electronics Applications Lab.,
Raipur Road,
Dehra Dun-248001. REVIEW APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India through
the Secretary,
Dept. of Defence Research & Dev.,
Ministry of Defence,
South Block,
New Delhi.
2. The Director General,
Research & Dev.,
R&D Organisation,
Ministry of Defence,
'B' Wing, Sena Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. The Director,
Defence Electronics Applications Lab.,
Dehra Dun.
4. The Director,
Institute of Technology Mgmt.,
Landour Cantt.,
Mussoorie-248179 (U.P.)
5. Shri R.C. Joshi,
Stores Supdt.,
Defence Electronics Laboratory,
Dehradun. RESPONDENTS

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

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

Perused the R.A.

2. Under Section 22(3)(f) A.T. Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. an order/decision/judgment of the Tribunal can be reviewed

A

(i) on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record;

(ii) any discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed; and

(iii) for any other sufficient reason meaning analogous reason.

3. None of the grounds taken in the R.A. bring it within the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. as noted above.

4. The review applicant has contended that the same relief was granted to Shri R.C.Joshi and hence he cannot be denied the same, but the Respondents in para 2 of their reply to the O.A. have frankly admitted that an illegality was committed in Joshi's case, and have correctly pointed out that one illegality cannot justify another.

5. The R.A. is rejected.

A. Vedavalli

(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
Member (J)
/GK/

S.R. Adige
(S.R. ADIGE)
Member (A)