

2

82

h

Versus

- h


Hon'ble Mr. K. Muthukumar, Member (A)


We have seen the Review Application filed on our order dated 19.9.1997 in the M.P. No.2385 of 1991 in O.A. No. 276 of 1989. In para 4 of our order, we have pointed out that on the basis of the affidavit filed by the respondents dated

.2.

14.2.1997 and on the basis of the memo of appearance filed along with the affidavit signed by the Senior Administrative Officer in the Ministry of Defence, we have held that the learned counsel Shri P.H. Ramchandani has the necessary authorisation to appear on behalf of the respondents. The contention of the Review Applicants that the Tribunal had acted without any material on record from respondent Nos. 1 to 3 is, therefore, not acceptable.

2. We have held that there had been no violation of the provisions of Order VI Rule 15(2) of the CPC and the counter-reply of the respondents contained a declaration as provided in Rule 15(2) of the CPC. Therefore, we do not accept the contention of the Review Applicants that the order of the Tribunal was based on oral utterances of Shri Ramchandani. We do not find any force in the other submissions of the Review Applicants and the Review Applicants cannot reagitate the same matters in the Review Application. In the light of this, we do not find any error on the face of the record. The Review Application is accordingly rejected.

  
(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)  
MEMBER (J)

  
(K. MUTHUKUMAR)  
MEMBER (A)

Rakesh