

164

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

RA No.263/92 in
OA No.1842/89

Date of decision: 4th Aug. 92

Sh.D.R.Nim

...

Applicant

versus

The Director of Education,
Delhi Admn., Delhi.

...

Respondents

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR.T.S.OBEROI, MEMBER(J)

ORDER

This Review Application has been filed by the applicant in OA No.1842/89, decided on 30.4.1992. Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 provides for the same powers for review, as contained in Order 47, Rule 1, Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. Precisely, these provide for the following contingencies for review of a decision/judgement/order:-

- (i) if it suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record; or
- (ii) is liable to be reviewed on account of discovery of any new material or evidence which was not within the knowledge of the party or could not be produced by him at the time the judgement was made, despite due diligence; or
- (iii) for any other sufficient reason construed to mean "analogous reason".

2. I have examined the grounds of review, urged in the present RA, in the light of the above provisions. I feel that precisely, the same points have been urged in the RA, as were put forth during hearing of the OA. The scope for review is limited and by no means is meant to seek a rehearing. Accordingly, I find no

been

merit in the present RA which accordingly is rejected.

A copy of this order be sent to the Review Applicant.

4/8/92
(T.S.OBEROI)
MEMBER(J)