

14

In the Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench: New Delhi

Regn. No. RA 108/1992 in  
OA 828/1989

Date of decision: 16.04.1993.

Shri S.K. Garg

...Original Applicant/Respondent  
in the Review Application

Versus

U.O.I. & Others

...Original Respondents/Petitioner  
in the Review Application

For the Applicant in the RA

..Mrs. Sheil Sethi, Counsel

For the Respondents in the RA

..Sh. B.K. Agarwal, Counsel

**CORAM:-**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.K. DHAON, VICE-CHAIRMAN  
THE HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?

**JUDGEMENT(ORAL)**  
(of the Bench delivered by Hon'ble Mr.  
Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman)

This is an application seeking review of the order dated 12.02.1992 passed by a Bench consisting of one of us (I.K. Rasgotra) as a Member. In the order it is noted that the learned counsel for the respondents was not present on 12.02.1992. In the application filed, it is tried to be shown that on earlier occasions when the matter was listed, the learned counsel for the respondents was present, all along on each date. It is also averred that Shri B.K. Agarwal, the learned counsel for the original applicant ~~does~~ not inform her about the date of hearing, i.e., 12.02.1992.

14

15

2. We are not entering into this controversy as it is rather embarrassing now to go into all these details. However, we are satisfied that the learned counsel for the respondents (in the OA) was vigilant all along. It may be that on account of misunderstanding, she could not appear on 12.02.1992 when the case was taken up for hearing. On merit, there can be no two opinions that the order dated 12.02.1992 does not suffer from any error apparent on the face of record. No grounds, therefore, is made out for review of our order.

3. With these directions this application is disposed of.

*Subrahmanyam*  
(I.K. RASGOTRA)  
MEMBER (A)

16.04.1993

*Surya*  
(S.K. DHAON)  
VICE CHAIRMAN  
16.04.1993

RKS  
160493