

(28)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

BA 52/2002 in  
OA 1586/2000

New Delhi this the 15 th day of March, 2002

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J)  
Hon'ble Shri Govindan S. Tampi, Member (A)

1. M.S. Bahra,  
S/o late Sh. Thakur Singh,  
Technical Officer,  
E-in-C's Branch (CSCC) AHQ,  
New Delhi-110 011.

Residential Address :-

No. 1, Kiran Vihar,  
Vikas Marg,  
Delhi-110 092.

2. R.C. Mehta,  
Technical Officer,  
Commander Works Engineer,  
Meerut Cantt.

Residential Address :-

278/1, MES Officers Qtrs.,  
Clement Street, Near Supply Depot,  
Meerut Cantt. (UP)

3. M.S. Ranga,  
Technical Officer,  
E-in-C's Branch (CSCC) AHQ,  
New Delhi-110 011.

Residential Address :-

A-220, Sarojini Nagar,  
New Delhi-110 023.

4. Arjun Kumar,  
Technical Officer,  
Commander Works Engineer,  
Delhi Cantt.

5. Banarsi Dass,  
Technical Officer,  
E-in-C's Branch, AHQ,  
New Delhi.

6. R.S. Vashist,  
Technical Officer,  
E-in-C's Branch, AHQ,  
New Delhi.

29

7. Mrs.Meena Anand,  
Technical Officer,  
O/o Chief Engineer,  
Delhi Zone,  
Delhi Cantt.
8. Mrs.Urmila Popli,  
Technical Officer,  
O/o Chief Engineer,  
Delhi Zone,  
Delhi Cantt.
9. Mrs.S.Choudhary,  
Technical Officer,  
CWE Utility,  
Delhi Cantt.
10. Yogindra Pall,  
Technical Officer,  
Chief Engineer, Race Course,  
New Delhi.
11. Bhopal Singh,  
Technical Officer,  
GE Air Force,  
Tugalkabad,  
New Delhi.

..... APPLICANTS.

V E R S U S

1. Union of India, through  
The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
South Block, Govt. of India,  
New Delhi.
2. The Engineer-in-Chief,  
E-in-C's Branch, AHQ,  
New Delhi-110 011.
3. The Commander Works Engineer,  
Meerut Cantt.

..... RESPONDENTS.

VR

O R D E R (By Circulation )

(Hon'ble Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan, Vice Chairman (J) )

We have carefully perused the averments made by the applicants in the Review Application (RA 52/2002) praying for review of the order dated 11.1.2002 in OA 1586/2000. They have prayed that the Tribunal's order should be recalled in the interest of justice to make oral submissions in the RA for proper appreciation and decision of the RA.

2. Under Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985 read with Rule 17 (2) and (3) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, a review application shall be disposed of by circulation which had passed the order in OA 1586/2000 if the same Bench is available. As the same Bench is available, we are of the view that the same can be disposed of by circulation. Accordingly we have proceeded to consider the grounds taken in the RA.

3. It is clear from a perusal of the RA that what the applicants are trying to do is to re-argue the case as if it is an appeal which it is, settled law, does not come within the scope of the RA (See the judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Chandra Kanta and Anr. Vs. Sheik Habir ( (AIR) 1975 SC 1500) and A.T.Sharma Vs. A.P.Sharma (AIR 1979 SC 1047). In the present case the applicants cannot re-argue the

9/11

31

-4-

same contentions which have been considered in the order passed in OA 1586/2000 as if it is an appeal. (See Meera Bhanja Vs.Nirmala Kumari Choudhaury (AIR) 1995 SC 455). As there is no error apparent on the face of the record or any other sufficient grounds as provided under Order 47, Rule 1 CPC read with the provisions of Rule 17 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, RA 52/2002 is rejected.

(Govindan S.Tampi )  
Member (A)

sk

(Smt.Lakshmi Swaminathan )  
Vice Chairman (J)