

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to **PDF Replacer Pro**.
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

RA.No.168 of 1999
in
OA.No.584 of 1993

New Delhi, this 28th day of August, 2000

AK
2Y

HON'BLE MR.KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER(J)
HON'BLE MRS.SHANTA SHAstry, MEMBER(A)

S.P. Saraswat
S/o Late Pt. Shiv Charan Das
R/o XY-50 Sarojini Nagar
New Delhi. ... Applicant

(By Advocate:Shri B.S.Mainee)

versus

Union of India, through

1. The Director General Audit,
Post & Telecommunication
Old Secretariat
Civil Lines
Delhi-110054
2. The Director of Audit
P&T Branch Audit Office Delhi
Old Secretariat
Civil Lines
Delhi
3. The Comptroller & Auditor General
of India
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi
3. The Controller General of Accounts
Lok Nayak Bhavan
New Delhi-110001. ... Respondents

(By Advocate:Shri Madhav Panikar)

Order(oral)

By Shri Kuldip Singh, M(J)

This Review Application has been filed by the applicant seeking review/recall of order dated 8.3.1999 passed in OA.584/93. The grounds taken in the Review Application are that in the OA the applicant had called upon the respondents to produce some documents before the decision of
kr

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to **PDF Replacer Pro**.
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

the case and that during the pendency of the OA the applicant has moved a Miscellaneous Application praying for a direction to place on record the documents mentioned in the OA. The OA was admitted and listed for final hearing. At the time of hearing the records were not called for as the OA was dismissed. The respondents says the applicant has asked for non-existent records which were not available at all.

2. We have heard Shri B.S. Mainee, learned counsel for the applicant and gone through the judgement in question.

3. We find that the case of the applicant is that he had prayed for production of the the non-existent documents. The applicant informs that he was unable to produce the documents with regard to his promotion. We are unable to agree with this contention. If there was any such promotion, there should have been a proper order and Notification to which even public has access. The applicant cannot claim now that the records should have been produced by the respondents. He is asking for non-existent documents. We find there is no error apparent of the face of the record. The Review Application is liable to be dismissed. The same is dismissed.

Shanta S

(Mrs Shanta Shastry)
Member(A)

dbc

Kuldip Singh
(Kuldip Singh)
Member(J)