

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

R.A. No. 245/93
in
O.A. No. 1323/93

Date of Decision: 10-9-1993.

| | | |
|----------------------|-----|-------------|
| Dr. A.B. Hiramani | ... | Petitioner |
| | Vs. | |
| Union of India & Ors | ... | Respondents |

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member(A)

ORDER

The Review Application has been filed seeking review of my Judgement in O.A. No. 1323/92 decided on 15th June 1993. The principal ground adduced for the review is that in the said Judgement it was observed that on earlier occasions also similar arrangements had been made when persons junior to the petitioner were detailed to look after the duties of the post of Director for short duration and apparently the petitioner had not filed any representation on those occasions. This is stated to be on account of some mistake on the part of the petitioner. It is now clarified that on earlier occasion no junior official was allowed to officiate as Director, C.H.E.B. by passing the claim of the petitioner. Only once when the applicant was on leave his junior was asked to look after the work of Director, C.H.E.B. The above discovery of new and important evidence was not within the knowledge of the petitioner at the time the judgement dated 15.6.1993 was passed.

dl

....2

I have considered the matter carefully and perused the record. The observation made in the Judgement are based on the facts narrated by the petitioner himself in his representations dated 26.5.1993 and 4.6.1993 (page 14 & 16 of the paper book) that no junior official was earlier detailed to look after the duties of the higher post is not an event which was not known to the petitioner, had he exercised due diligence. In view of the above circumstances, I am of the opinion that the grounds adduced in the Review Application are not covered by Order 47 CPC. The Review Application is accordingly rejected, ~~in circulation.~~ *al*

al
(I.K. Rasgotra)
Member (A)

1*Mittal*