

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MADRAS BENCH**

Dated the Tuesday 8th day of August Two Thousand And Seventeen

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MR. R. RAMANUJAM, MEMBER (A)

M.A./310/00239/2017
In
Rev. App. No.6/2107
in
O.A./310/00815/2015

The Staff Selection Commission,
Through its Chairman,
Ministry of Department of Personnel and Training,
Government of India, Block No.12,
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi- 110 003.

....Applicant/
Applicant/
2nd Respondent

(By Advocate : Mr. K. Rajendran)

vs.

1. Union of India,
Through its Finance Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Revenue,
New Delhi ...1st Respondent/
1st Respondent/
1st Respondent
2. Jagana Anitha,
Block No. 10/1,
Central Revenue Quarters,
Anna Nagar West,
15th Main Road,
Chennai-600 040;
3. Devandla Lakshmi,
D.No.20.6.76, FF3,
Srinivasa Residency,
Ramaligeswarapet 3rd Lane,
Vijayawada- 520 003;
4. Rajeesh Kumar,
13th Main Road,
Annanagar Nehur Colony;
5. Vijayalakshmi P.,
4/12, Kailasanathar Koil 1st Cross Street,
Thirumurugan Nagar, Gomathipuram,
Thiruninravur- 602 024;

6. Puli Swathi Bharani,
H.No.6-2-793, Chintal Basthi,
Opp. Shadan College Lane,
Khairthabad, Hyderabad- 500 004;
7. Shivali,
49/06, Front Side,
Ashok Nagar, New Delhi-18;
8. Chunni Lal,
C/o. Mangal Singh Thakur,
Street No.2, Deepak Nagar,
Durg,Chattisgarh- 491 001;
9. Vijendra,
Block No. 77/1, Central Revenue Quarters,
Annanagar(West), 15th Main Road,
Chennai- 600 040;
10. T.T. Bhuvaneshwari,
No.27, Nadu Street,
Thirukkattupalli,
Thanjavur, Tamilnadu;
11. Vishal Kapadia,
13/411, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur, Rajasthan,
12. Ravi Prakash,
Village Harvanshpur,
Post- Soram,
Allahabad, U.P.

.....Respondents 2-12/
.....Respondents 2-12/
Applicants.

(By Advocate: Mr. S. Thiruvengadam, Res.2-12)

ORAL ORDER
(Pronounced by Hon'ble Mr. R. Ramanujam, Member (A))

Learned counsel on both sides present.

2. This M.A. has been filed seeking to condone the delay of 60 days in filing the Review Application against the order dated 06.07.2016 in O.A. 815/2015.

3. Heard. Mr. K. Rajendran, Learned counsel for the applicant in Review Application submits that the R.A. applicants are not aggrieved with the order passed in the O.A. They are only seeking corrigendum, alleging that it had been erroneously recorded therein that the R.A. applicant had not been represented whereas he was actually present on the date of final hearing of the O.A. along with his reply statement. He had accordingly filed an M.A. for corrigendum. However, it was returned by the Registry with an oral direction to file a R.A.

4. Based on the facts submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant, I am of the view that if it is only a question of an error in recording the presence or otherwise of the counsel and the R.A. applicant is not aggrieved with the order per se, it would not constitute a matter for review.

5. R.A. applicant submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the R.A. He may do so. R.A. is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

6. In view of the withdrawal of the R.A., no decision is required on the M.A.

7. Registry is directed to accept the M.A. filed by the applicant and post it for 27.10.2017.