

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

20

R.A. No. 5/89 in 91
O.A. No. 670/90
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 6.2.1991

Smt. Raj Kumari	Petitioner
Shri B.S. Mainee	Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
Versus	
Union of India	Respondent
Shri O.P. Kshtriy	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.C. Jain, Administrative Member

The Hon'ble Mr. J.P. Sharma, Judicial Member

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

ORDER

(DELIVERED BY MR. J.P. SHARMA, HON'BLE MEMBER (J).)

The applicant has filed the review petition against the judgement dated 12.12.1990. There is no apparent error on the face of the judgement. The points raised by the applicant in para '6' have been fully discussed in the judgement itself. The original applications Nos. 638/90 and 670/90 were dismissed on the ground that the provisions of Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act were not complied with. The learned counsel for the applicant referred to certain judgements in para '12', but none of them was cited at the time of arguments. There was a specific plea taken by the respondents, Union of India that the applications are barred by Section 20 of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985.

(2)

In view of the judgement of the Full Bench in OA No.27/90, Shri B. Parameshwara Rao vs. The Divisional Engineer, Telecommunications, Eluru and Another decided on 12.4.1990 by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench, the person has come to the Tribunal after exhausting departmental remedies under Section 20(1) of Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985. The applicant was earlier a casual labourer, but he never applied for regularisation and had come direct before this Tribunal at the time when she was already facing an inquiry and O.A. No.638/90 was filed concealing all these facts and also made certain statements in the application which are contrary to facts. All the points raised by the applicant in the review have been discussed exhaustively in the judgement.

2. There is no force in the Review Application. It is dismissed by circulation.

Jainee
(J.P. SHARMA)

Dec 6/1991
(P.C. JAIN)
MEMBER (A)