

RA 144/88  
in  
CA 1940/88

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH DELHI

\*\*\*\*\*

Shri Subhash Chander has filed a Review  
Application against the order/judgement dated 11-10-88  
made by a Bench of this Tribunal comprising of the following:-

(1) Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy Vice Chairman  
(2) Hon'ble Mr. Ajay Jahan Member (AM)

In terms of Rule 17(ii), a review petition should  
ordinarily be heard by the same Bench which has passed the  
order, unless, for reasons to be recorded in writing, the  
Chairman may direct it to be heard by any other Bench.  
Further, in terms of Rule 17(iii) unless ordered otherwise  
by the Bench concerned, a review petition shall be disposed  
of by circulation where the Bench may either dismiss the  
petition or direct notice to be issued to the opposite party.

Since Shri Justice Puttaswamy & .... one of the Members  
of the aforesaid Bench has since retired/are not available  
at Delhi, it is for consideration whether the same may be  
disposed of by the same Bench or by another Bench consisting  
of Members from the Principal Bench.

In case, it is decided that the review petition is to be  
disposed of by the same Bench, then it is suggested that  
it may be disposed of by circulation by sending a copy of the  
same.

305/J  
22/11/88

1816 (CWL 88)  
22/11/88  
DRD

HON'BLE CHAIRMAN

By circulation

Ad  
24/11/88

Lates  
22/11/88

Ad  
22/11/88

Q.T.O

DRD

24/11/88  
S.O.MD

From prepage.

I have carefully read the order and the grounds urged by the applicant in his Review Application.

2. In my opinion, the order made by the Division Bench, does not suffer from a patent error, to justify a review under the Act. In reality and in substance, the applicant is asking the Bench to re-examine the order made as if we are a court of appeal and come to a different conclusion which is impermissible in review. From this it follows, that this application for review, which is devoid of merit, is liable to be rejected. I, therefore, propose to reject this application for review.

*Mr. Puttaswamy*  
(K.S. Puttaswamy)

17-2-1989.

Vice-Chairman.

17-2-1989.

Hon'ble Ajay Johri, Member (A).

I have read the order and gone through the grounds made by the applicant in his review application seeking a review of our orders dated 11.10.1988 in the Original Application.

2. I agree with my learned Brother, Hon. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, V.C., that the order does not suffer from any patent error and no new point of law or any material which was not in the knowledge of the applicant at the time when OA was argued has been brought out in the review application. What he is seeking is only a revision of our orders given in OA which does not come within the parameters on which a review can be sought. The application being without merit, I agree with the proposal made by my learned Brother for rejection of the review application.

*B.N.R.S. (A)*  
MEMBER (A).

Dated: February 23, 1989.  
PG.