

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH DELHI

Shri B M L Bhandary has filed a Review Application against the ~~order~~/judgement dated 16-11-88 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 Jethani Member (A.M.)

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 K.S. Puttaswamy...one of the Members of the aforesaid Bench has ~~since retired~~ / is 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.

HON'BLE CHAIRMAN

By circulation.

Ad
24/11/88

DR (J)

S.D. 1/1
24/11

P.T.O.

7

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.

K. S. Puttaswamy
(K. S. Puttaswamy)
17-2-1989.

Vice-Chairman.

17-2-1989.