

In the Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

RA No.303/92 in  
OA No.1277/87

Date of Order: 09.11.1992.

Hira Mani Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through ...Respondents  
General Manager, Northern Railway & Others

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (J)  
The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

O R D E R

This Review Application has been filed seeking review of our judgement in OA-1277/87 rendered on 7.7.1992. Apart from bringing out some typographical errors in the dates the principal ground for seeking the review is that the petitioner is entitled to seniority in his cadre w.e.f. 5.2.1965 in accordance with Rule 311 of I.R.E.M. and although the rule-position was brought to the notice of the Tribunal during the final hearing, the same has not been taken into consideration and the petition disallowed.

2. As far as the correction of the dates is concerned, we order that:-

i) in line-8 of paragraph-1 the date of Annexure A-II which is shown as 3.12.1987 be substituted as 12.3.1987.

ii) In line-2 of paragraph-2 the date of appointment of the applicant as Khallasi shown as **20.10.1964** be substituted as **20.01.1964**.

iii) In paragraph-2 of page-2 in line-6 the date **9.11.1972** be substituted as **19.7.1977**.

iv) In paragraph-4, page 5 of the judgement in line-7 date **18.4.1977** be substituted by **18.4.1967**.

v) In line 14 at page-7 the date **13.6.1967** be substituted by **13.7.1967**.

The corrections as made above in the various dates have been considered by us in the context of the facts of the case and the judgement rendered. We do not find these corrections as justifying the review of the judgement as the basic issues involved and the conclusions arrived at are not affected by these typographical errors.

3. The other grounds adduced by the petitioner justifying the review have already been taken into consideration while rendering the judgement. The ground that some typographical errors had crept in in transcribing the dates, cannot be made a vehicle for rearguing the case. There are no other errors apparent on the face of record nor any evidence/documents have become available which were

not available to the petitioner when the case was heard with exercise of due diligence. The Review Application is thus partly allowed by amending the dates, as indicated in paragraph-1 above. The Registry is directed to amend the said dates in all the copies of the judgements/send amended copies of the judgement to the concerned.

The R.A. is disposed of as above in circulation.

*Subh*  
(I.K. RASGOTRA)  
MEMBER(A) 9/1/92

*Subh*  
9/1/92  
(P.K. KARTHA)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN