

21

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,
NEW DELHI.

R.A.No.259/95
in
O.A.No.2443/89.

Date of Decision: 10.10.95.

HON'BLE MR. S.R.ADIGE, MEMBER(A).
HON'BLE MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN, MEMBER(J).

Lt. Governor of Delhi & anotherReview applicant.

Versus

Shri H.K.KatyalRespondents.

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

By Hon'ble Mr. S.R.Adige, Member(A).

This is a review application bearing No.259/95 filed by the Lt. Governor, Delhi & another on 21.8.95 praying for review of the judgment dated 2.12.94 in O.A.No. 2443/89 Shri H.K.Katyal Vs. L.G.Delhi & another.

2. A petition for condonation of delay has been filed, on the ground that the review application was drafted twice but was misplaced by the Clerk of the Advocate and could not be filed. In this petition it has also been stated that the L.G. & another had filed M.A.No.834/95 praying for time for implementation of the judgment dated 2.12.94 and by Tribunal's order dated 27.4.94 the time to implement those orders was extended upto 2.7.95.


3. It is manifest that the grounds urged for condonation of delay are wholly inadequate and unconvincing. If the L.G.Delhi & another had sought time to implement the judgment dated 2.12.94, it is all the more necessary that the judgment should have been implemented by now.

4. A perusal of the contents of the review

/

application also makes it abundantly clear that none of the grounds contained therein bring it within the scope of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC under which alone any decision/judgment/order of the Tribunal can be reviewed.

5. This review application is therefore rejected.


(MRS. LAKSHMI SWAMINATHAN)
MEMBER (J)


(S.R. ADIGE)
MEMBER (A).

/ug/