

## THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

N E W D E L H I

R.A. No. 167/90 in  
O.A. No. 915/88  
T.A. No. 928x

199

DATE OF DECISION 15 February '91.Mr. D. N. Paul

Petitioner

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & Others.

Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

## CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. T. S. Oberoi, Member (J)

The Hon'ble Mr. I. K. Rasgotra, Member (A).

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? no
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? no
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? no
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? no

O R D E R

By this Review Application, the applicant wants us to review our Judgement dated 24th September, 1990, in O.A. No. 915/88, on the grounds mentioned therein. We proceed to decide the Review Application, by Circulation, in terms of Rule 17(iii) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987.

2. Section 22(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, provides for the same powers of review, as are vested in a Civil Court, under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. As per Order XLVII, Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code, a decision/judgement/order may be reviewed:

- i) if it suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record; or
- ii) if on account of discovery of any new material or evidence which was not within the knowledge of

Deen

...contd.. 20...

the party or could not be produced by him at the time the judgement was made, inspite of due diligence;

or

iii) for any other sufficient reason.

3. We have examined the various grounds mentioned in the Review Application in the light of the above provisions, and are of the considered view that all the aspects emerging from these grounds have been broadly dwelt upon, in our judgement, review of which has been sought for. We have, therefore, no hesitation in holding that any other view, if taken by us, would amount to setting in judgement on our own view, taken by us, in the judgement, in question. We, therefore, do not find any merit, in the present application, which is, accordingly, rejected.

*De Lihji*

(I.K.RASGOTRA )

Member (A)

*Keri* 1.2.91

( T.S.OBEPOL )

Member (J)