

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH : NEW DELHI

(X)

RA No. 367/93
in
OA No. 995/93

Date of Order: 18.11.93.

Nathi Ram Bhardwaj

Petitioner

Union of India

Vs

Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Shri J.P. Sharma, Member (J)

Hon'ble Shri S. Gurusankaran, Member (A)

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

The applicant has filed this application for review of the judgement dated 24.8.1993 by which the original application was dismissed as not maintainable and barred by the principles of res judicata.

In Para 1 & 2 the applicant has stated certain facts. In para 3 of the Review Application the applicant has referred to the relief prayed in TA No. 446/86 and OA No. 995/93 stating that they were quite different. It is stated that the Tribunal had not considered the difference between the two applications and between the prayer one for treating the period as duty and the other to regularise the period in any manner which may be convenient, proper and just in the circumstances of the case except that the period under reference may not be allowed to remain as 'Dies non'. We have considered this aspect in the judgement itself and in the judgement in TA No. 446/86 in Para 4 of the judgment dated 13.4.1992, the Tribunal held that decision of the authority for treating this portion

6

of the period from 15.10.1981 to 25.8.1983 as 'Dies Non' does not call for any interference. The same relief has been claimed by the applicant in the OA No. 995/93. Thus, the decision given in the OA does not show any error apparent on the face of the record and the Review Application therefore is devoid of merit and dismissed by circulation.

Gurusankaran
(S. Gurusankaran)
Member(A)

J. P. Sharma
(J. P. Sharma)
Member(J) 18.11.93.

Mittal