

(10)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA NO.14/91 in  
OA NO.811/89

DATE OF DECISION: 30/1/1991

SHRI B.D. MEHTA

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAV BANERJI, CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER (A)

FOR THE APPLICANT

SHRI S.L. LAKHANPAL, COUNSEL

The above Review Application has been filed under Section 17 of the Administrative Tribunals (Procedure) Rules, seeking review of the judgement delivered on 21.12.1990 in OA No. 811/89. The operative part of the said judgement is as under:-


"In the facts and circumstances of the case, we order and direct that the applicant's pay should be fixed as Stenographer Grade 'A' at the level at which his juniors were drawing pay on 16.1.1985 by virtue of officiating in Grade 'A'. His date of next increment will also be fixed as that of his immediate junior. No arrears will be payable. The applicant shall also be entitled to all consequential benefits by way of revision of pension and other terminal benefits.

There will be no order as to costs."

The prayer of the applicant is that besides the stepping up of his pay he should also be allowed the arrears of pay for the period 16.1.1985 to 30.4.1988.

We have considered the matter carefully. The Review Application lies in a very narrow compass. The judgement once delivered can be reviewed only if there is a patent error on the face of the record or some new facts have come to the notice of the applicant, which were not known to him even after exercising due diligence. The Review Application does not lie on the merits of the case.

In view of the above, we do not find any justification for reviewing the judgement delivered on 21.12.1990. The Review Application is accordingly rejected.

  
(I.K. RASGOTRA)  
MEMBER(A) 30/1/91

  
(AMITAV BANERJI)  
CHAIRMAN

'SKK'