

(1)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

R.A.209/2001 IN
O.A.480/2000

Monday, this the 4th day of June, 2001

HON'BLE SHRI S.A.T. RIZVI, MEMBER (ADMN)

1. Union of India
Department of Posts,
Dak Tar Bhawan,
New Delhi
(Through The Director)
2. The Chief Post Master General
Delhi Circle.
New Delhi.
3. The Sr. Supdt. of Post Office
Delhi North Division
Civil Lines
Delhi.
4. The Asstt. Supdt. of Post Office
Delhi North IIIrd Division
Delhi-85.

..Applicants

VERSUS

Shri Lalit Kumar
R/O L-I-32, Budh Vihar,
Delhi-41.

..Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

RA No. 209/2001 has been filed by the applicant for review of the order passed in OA-480/2000 on 2.1.2001.

2. After going through the RA, I find that the review applicants have tried to re-argue the case by reagitating, by and large, the same issues which they had raised in the OA. The points raised were considered at sufficient length by the Tribunal while deciding the OA-480/2000.

3. I also find that there has been an abnormal delay in the filing of the present RA. Law provides for a

2/

period of 30 days for filing Review Applications. In the present case, a copy of the order passed by this Tribunal in the aforesaid OA was received by the review applicants on 24.1.2001, and the present RA has been filed on 8.5.2001, i.e., more than three months after the order of this Tribunal aforesaid became available to the review applicants. The reasons assigned for delay in the application for condonation of delay are the least convincing. The review applicants have therein only tried to argue that the delays are built in in the processes and the procedures internally followed by the review applicants. I cannot accept this proposition. Indeed, having known the legal position, the review applicants were duty bound to compress and expedite the processes and the procedures so as to be able to file the present RA within the period of limitation.

4. Review of the aforesaid order has been sought additionally on the ground of discovery of an important matter, namely, the order passed by a Full Bench of this Tribunal at Bangalore in OA Nos. 100, 101 etc. of 1999, decided on 19/20.4.2000. This too is, I find, not acceptable, inasmuch as the review applicant has not convincingly shown that the aforesaid order of the F.B. could not become available to him even after exercise of due diligence.

5. After a careful consideration of the matter, I also not find any error apparent on the face of the record nor do I find any other justification which may require review of my order under Order XLVII Rule 1 of

2/

(3)

3

the CPC read with Section 22 (3)(f) of the
Administration Tribunals Act, 1985.

6. In the circumstances, the RA is rejected.



(S.A.T. RIZVI)
MEMBER (A)

/sunil/