

Date	Office Report	Orders
		<p><u>1/1/96</u> <u>RAM 32195</u></p> <p>Orders on RA- are placed on the record which have been passed in circulation.</p> <p>B.O</p> <p><i>Dhru</i> <u>1/1/96</u> (S.R. Dhru) SPA</p> <p><u>DR(S)</u></p>

(S)
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

R.A. NO. 321/1995
in
D.A. NO. 1654/1995

New Delhi this the 1st day of January, 1996.

HON'BLE SHRI N. V. KRISHNAN, ACTING CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE SMT. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER (J)

Anil Kumar ... Applicant
(By Shri B. S. Oberoi, Advocate)

-Versus-

Govt. of National Capital
Territory of Delhi. ... Respondent

O R D E R (By Circulation)

Shri N. V. Krishnan, Acting Chairman --

D.A. 1654/1995 filed by the applicant was dismissed on 13.10.1995 as being barred by limitation. The applicant has sought a review of that order. We have perused the review application. We are satisfied that it can be disposed of by circulation and we proceed to do so.

2. We notice that when the matter came up on 7.9.1995, we wanted to know from the learned counsel why the D.A. should not be dismissed on grounds of delay. He sought time to produce authorities not mentioned in the M.A. for condonation of delay. The case was again listed on 26.9.1995. The learned counsel appeared and asked for time upto 13.10.1995. On that date, none appeared and no authority was produced. It is stated in the review application that the D.A. has been dismissed without giving the applicant a hearing on the point of limitation. This is factually incorrect as seen from the above facts.

3. No other error has been pointed out excepting to cite certain Supreme Court judgments. These were ^{the} ~~not~~ mentioned when we heard the case. Hence, this does not amount to an error with respect to the order already passed. Hence, the review application is dismissed.

Lakshmi Swaminathan

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)

N. V. Krishnan
1.1.86

(N. V. Krishnan)
Acting Chairman

/as/