

15

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

RA No. 95/1998 in  
OA 2486/1997

New Delhi this the 29th Day of June, 1998.

**Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)**  
**Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)**

1. Parasram Dass(D-448),  
S/O Late Shri T.R.Dass,  
R/O C-12, P.S. Rajouri Garden,  
New Delhi.
2. Inder Pal(D-423),  
S/O Shri Yadram,  
R/O F-2907, Netaji Nagar,  
New Delhi.
3. Narain Singh(D-425),  
S/O Sh. Hardev Singh,  
R/O 294, Police Colony,  
Ashok Vihar, New Delhi.

..Applicants

Vs

1. Commissioner of Police,  
Police Headquarters, I.P.Estate,  
MSO Building, New Delhi.

..Respondent

O R D E R (By circulation)

**Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)**

Review Application 95/98 has been filed by Shri Shankar Raju, learned counsel on behalf of the applicants praying for review of the impugned order dated 23.3.98 in OA 2486/1997.

2. We have carefully perused the R.A. The impugned order was delivered after hearing the arguments of Shri Shyam Babu, learned counsel on behalf of the applicants. In the R.A. the applicants have sought to re-argue the case in the interest of justice. They have also submitted that they have discovered some material pertaining to the case which was not available earlier, namely, the discovery of the names of S/Sh. Ram and Gyan Singh, whose names were in the list of 6.5.96 and promoted on 7.8.1997. We note that Shri Shankar Raju, learned counsel being well aware of the limited scope and ambit of a Review petition under Section

22(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, under which alone a review of a decision/order/judgement of the Tribunal is permissible, he has tried to somehow bring it within the scope of those provisions. However, we do not find these grounds sufficient to review the impugned order dated 23.3.98 in OA 2486/1997. A perusal of our judgments shows that it is a detailed and reasoned one delivered after hearing both the parties at considerable length. It is settled law that the applicant cannot use the instrumentality of the R.A. as if it is an appeal to re-argue the same contentions. In the facts and circumstances of the case the ground of discovery of 'new' material in the relevant lists of 1996 and 1997 is also baseless.

3. As we find no good ground to allow the R.A. as there is no error apparent on the face of the record or any other ground justifying the same, R.A. 95/98 is rejected.

*Lakshmi Swaminathan*  
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)  
Member (J)

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