

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

RA.110/94 IN OA.797/88.

New Delhi, dated this the 5th of September, 1994.

Shri C.J. Roy, Hon. Member(J)

Shri P.T. Thiruvengadam, Hon. Member(A)

Shri Gurbachan Singh Sawhney,
S/o Late Shri Kartar Singh Sawhney,
B/36, Khyala JJ Colony,
New Delhi 110 018.

...Applicant

Applicant in person.

VERSUS

Union of India through

1. Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
South Block, New Delhi 110 011.

2. Engineer-in-Chief,
Army Headquarters,
Kashmir House,
New Delhi 110 011.

3. Chief Engineer,
Northern Command
C/o 56 APO.

4. Chief Engineer,
Udhampur Zone,
Post Office GARHI
Udhampur (J&K).

5. Commander,
HQ 135 Works Engineers,
C/o 56 APO.

...Respondents

O R D E R (Oral) IN R.A.

(By Shri C.J. Roy)

Heard the applicant. This is a review filed by the applicant against the order of the same Bench in OA.797/88, which was disposed of on 7.2.94, on the ground that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this case, besides, this case being barred by limitation.

2. The applicant now filed this review raising the main points as if he is urging the main case again on merits, which are not to be considered by us now.

(S)

14

3. However, for the sake of the applicant who is appearing in person, we explain ^{and inform} the Rule 47(1) of the Civil Procedure Code, as to when / review is maintainable.

(i) The review is maintainable only when any material which could not be procured even by due diligence at the time when the case was argued and subsequently the material is obtained which has a bearing on the case;

(ii) When there is a mistake apparent on the fact of the record;

(iii) If there is any sufficient reason.

4. None of the conditions are present in this review application.

5. Since the applicant is arguing his case in person, we have heard him patiently again and he is labouring under the impression that having filed a memorial to the President of India in 1976 and not got any reply, it is not his fault but the fault is on the part of the department. However, it is not the ground for us to interfere. The jurisdiction and limitation has been defined and ~~modified~~ ^{clarified} in Section-21 of the Administrative Tribunal's Act, 1985. Therefore, we are very reluctant to resort to review in this case.

6. The review is dismissed with no order as to costs.

P. T. Thiruvengadam

(P.T. THIRUVENGADAM)
MEMBER(A)

(W.S.)
(C.J. ROY)
MEMBER(C)

/kam060994/