

# LIBRARY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

## CALCUTTA BENCH

Title of the Case: R. A No. 350/6 of 2010

M.A. No. 350/195/2020

In the matter of (O.A. 350/450/2018)

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

(INCOME TAX)

..... Petitioners/Respondents

VERSUS

Aloka Sahis

..... Opposite Party

In the matter of:

O.A. No. 350/450/2018

Aloka Sahis

..... Applicant

-VERSUS-

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (Income Tax)

..... Respondents

AND

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application under Rule 17 of the Central  
Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987

AND

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application for review of the order dated  
12.11.2018 passed by this Hon'ble Tribunal in  
aforesaid O.A No. 350/450/2018, Aloka Sahis vs.

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (Income Tax).

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
KOLKATA BENCH  
KOLKATA

No.R.A.350/06/2020  
M.A.350/195/2020  
Arising out of  
O.A.350/450/2018

Date of order : 3/7/2020.

Coram : Hon'ble Mrs. Bidisha Banerjee, Judicial Member  
Hon'ble Dr.(Ms) Nandita Chatterjee, Administrative Member

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS(I. Tax)  
VS.  
ALOKA SAHIS

For the Review Applicants : Ms. D. Nag, counsel  
For the Respondents : None

**ORDER**  
**(DISPOSED OF BY CIRCULATION)**

Bidisha Banerjee, Judicial Member

This R.A has been placed for consideration under Rule 49, Para-I, Sub Para (I) of Appendix IV of CAT Rules of Practice, 1993.

2. Perused the records of the R.A and M.A. and the order which is sought to be reviewed along with the records of O.A.

3. Copy of the order dated 12.11.2018 which has been sought to be reviewed, has been received by the applicant on 30.11.2018 and this RA has been filed on 06.03.2020 i.e. much after the period provided under Rule 17 of the A.T. Act, 1985. Hence, by filing MA the applicant has sought to condone the delay.

4. The **FULL BENCH** of the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh High Court in the case of **G.Narasimha Rao vs Regional Joint Director of School Education, Warrangal & Ors, 2005 (4) SLR 720** held that the review petition filed beyond the period of

limitation provided under Rule 17 of the A.T. Act cannot be entertained. This was also the view consistently taken by this Bench in many cases in past.

5. Hence, both MA and RA stand dismissed.

(Dr. Nandita Chatterjee)  
Administrative Member

(Bidisha Banerjee)  
Judicial Member

sb

