

In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi

Regn. No. RA- 184/93 In
OA- 917/93

Date: 5-7-93

Shri Jag Mohan Bhandari Applicant

Versus

Union of India Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Administrative Member
Hon'ble Mr. J.P. Sharma, Member (Judl.)

(Judgement by Hon'ble Mr. J.P. Sharma, Member)

Aggrieved by the judgement and order dated 29.4.1993 passed in OA-917/93, the applicant has filed this review application with the prayer that the impugned orders dated 22.12.1992, be declared illegal and void and the applicant be ordered to be reinstated as Cashier, Category 'A' with placement in original position with complete/proper charge of the Cashier.

2. We have perused the records of the case and also have gone through the judgement under review. The review of an order, as laid down under Order 47, Rule ⁽¹⁾ ~~47~~ C.P.C., lies on the ground when there is an error apparent on the face of the judgement/order, or that any substantial evidence which was not in the knowledge of the applicant, is now being filed for consideration to consider the finding given in the judgement, in the light of the aforesaid document and on such analogous ground.

de

6
b

3. The applicant in this review application has only averred certain further points, reopening the whole case. Even though grounds now urged do not help the applicant, as there is a categorical finding in the judgement that the applicant himself by a letter dated 7.7.1992, addressed to the Senior Administrative Officer, has stated, "Due to eyesight problem, I am facing certain problems to continue as Cashier. I, therefore, request that my services may please be utilised in the Section. The arrangements may also please be made to appoint someone from the Section as Cashier vice me." In view of this, the finding arrived at in the judgement does not need any reconsideration even in the light of the further averments made in the review application. The contention of the applicant that he has submitted this letter under duress, ~~cannot~~ cannot be accepted.

4. In fact, in the review application, the applicant has desired certain answers to queries from the respondents and that is not the scope of the review application. There is no error apparent on the face of the judgement, nor any further evidence has been desired to be considered for the review applicant. The application, therefore, is not maintainable and is dismissed.

J.P. Sharma
(J.P. Sharma)
Member (J)

I.K. Rasgotra
(I.K. Rasgotra)
Administrative Member