

(2) (B) (C)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A.No.250/95

IN

O.A.No.635/95

18th

New Delhi: Dated the April, 1996.

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

HON'BLE DR.A.VEDAVALLI, MEMBER(J).

Shri Chaman Lal
S/o Shri Ram Khelawan,
34-L, Central Govt.
Housing Complex,
Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi-110057.Review Applicant.
Shri P.M.Ahlawat, Advocate.

Versus

1. Union of India
through
The Secretary,
Ministry of Urban Affairs &
Employment,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001.
2. The Land & Development
Officer,
Ministry of Urban Affairs &
Employment,
Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.
Shri N.S.Mehta, Advocate.
3. Shri Ram Lal Singla,
s/o Late Shri Janki Das,
r/o C-113, Ashok Vihar,
Phase-I,
New Delhi -52.Respondents.
Mrs. Mukta Gupta, Advocate.

A

76

JUDGMENT

By Hon'ble Mr. S.R. Adige, Member (A).

We have perused the RA and have also heard the parties.

2. Under Section 22(3)(f) AT Act, 1985 read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, 1908, a judgment/decision/order of the Tribunal can be reviewed only if;

- i) it suffers from any error or mistake apparent on the face on the record;
- ii) new and important material or evidence is discovered which was not within the knowledge of the parties or could not be produced by that party at the time the judgment was made, despite due diligence; or
- iii) for any other sufficient reason construed to mean analogous grounds.

3. A perusal of the contents of the impugned judgment makes it abundantly clear that none of the above grounds are made out to bring it within the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC.

4. The impugned judgment dated 5.9.95 was a well considered one, delivered after considering the recent judicial pronouncements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the subject and we are unable to agree that the same warrants any review.

5. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed.

A. Vedaiah
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
MEMBER (J)

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

/ug/