

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.282/99 in OA No.95/95

New Delhi, this 6th day of January, 2000

Hon'ble Shri Justice V. Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)
Hon'ble Smt. Shantha Shastry, Member(A)

18

Smt. Rita Banerjee
503/II, Kirti Apartments
Mayur Vihar, Delhi-110 002

.. Applicant

(By applicant in person)

versus

Union of India, through

1. Secretary
Department of Science & Technology
New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi

2. Secretary
Union Public Service Commission
Shahjahan Road, New Delhi

.. Respondents

ORDER(in circulation)

By Reddy, J.-

- This review application has been filed on behalf of the applicant seeking review of the judgement and order dated 1.11.99 by which OA 95/95 alongwith OA 96/95 and OA 98/95 involving identical issues was dismissed by a common order, for the reasons mentioned therein.

2. In the present RA, we find that the applicant has tried to build up a case on the same facts and grounds which were raised in her OA, which were duly considered by us before the OA was dismissed as stated above. We do not find that the review applicant has come with any valid grounds, let alone convincing ones, that would warrant review of our judgement dated 1.11.99. Therefore, the present RA is not maintainable.

CAB

19

3. That apart, it would be pertinent to reiterate here that the scope of review is very limited. The Tribunal under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with the provisions of Order 47, Rule 1 of CPC exercises the power of review if there is (1) discovery of a new and important piece of evidence, which inspite of due diligence was not available with the review applicant at the time of hearing or when the order was made; (2) an error apparent on the face of the record or (3) any other analogous ground. Since none of these ingredients is available in the present RA, the same deserves to be dismissed. We do so accordingly.

Shantha J-
(Smt. Shantha Shastry)
Member(A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. Rajagopala Reddy)
Vice-Chairman(J)

/gtv/