## IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCCH: NEW DELHI

## RA No.216/97 in OA 303/95



New Delhi this the 29.th. day of September, 1997 Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J) Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

Shri I.J.Malhotra, 2118,Sector-D,Pocket-II Vasant Kunj,New Delhi

Applicant

Vs

Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-11

Respondents

## ORDER (By Circulation)

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

The applicant has sought review of the impugned dated 30.6.97 in OA.303/95. This. O.A. had been order taken up along with the bunch of cases and disposed of by a common order dated 30.6.97. In the Review Application the applicant has tried to put forward the same contentions Which have been considered in the impugned judgment/ Orderdated 30.6.97. applicant does not depend The discovery of any new and important materials which was not able to secure and produce in spite of due diligence when the  $\mathbf{0}_{ ext{riginal}}$  Application was heard and disposed f. The applicant has contended that there is no material to arrive at the conclusion in the impugned order dated 30.6.97. From the review application, it is seen that the applicant has contended that there is an error apparent on the face of the record, in order to bring, the limited

JS\_



the review of a decision/order/judgement of the Tribunal is permissible. However, in the garb of the review petition what the applicant actually seeks to appeal against our judgment order for which/review application does not lie. All the arguments taken in the review application have been considered in the impugned judgement dated 30.6.97 which is a detailed and reasoned one. It is settled law that old and overruled arguments are not sufficient grounds to allow the Review application.

For the reasons given above, this Review application is rejected.

(Sh R.K.Ahooja)

Member(A)

(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan)

Latel Smalle

Member(J)