

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench.

RA 46/96

in

Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 2 of 95 (OA 1246/90)

New Delhi this the 9th day of October, 1996

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J).

Hon'ble Shri R.K. Ahooja, Member(A).

In the matter of:

C.A.T. Principal Bench,
through Registrar,
Court on its own motion

.Prosecutor.

versus

1. Het-Ram,
S/o Shri Jag Ram,
Lab. Assistant, Northern Railway,
New Delhi.

2. Shri B.B. Raval, Advocate,
124, North Avenue,
New Delhi.

.Contemners.

(Review applicant Shri Het Ram present in person)

O R D E R

Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member(J).


This Review Application is in respect of the order dated 8.2.1996 passed in Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 2 of 1995. The review applicant was heard in person. His only submission was that he should be allowed to call his witnesses and be given more time to file written arguments.


2. We have carefully perused the Review Application. This application was also taken up along with the R.A. 47/96 for review of the same order dated 8.2.1996 passed in Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 2 of 1995.

98

3. The Review Application against the order in the Criminal Contempt Petition is not maintainable as there is no provision for such review. After careful perusal of the Review Application, we find that there is no error apparent on the face of the record, as alleged by the applicant, which warrants review of the order. In this case also the judgement of the Supreme Court dated 10.3.1995 in re: Vinay Chandra Mishra, three judges Bench, (AIR 1995 SC 2348) is applicable. In the garb of the Review Application, the applicant actually is seeking to appeal against the judgement which is, therefore, not in accordance with law. If the review applicant is aggrieved by the judgement dated 8.2.1996, the remedy is to file an appeal. The submission of the applicant that he may be granted more time to submit written arguments is rejected as it would not serve any purpose because what he has attempted in the Review Application is to reargue the matter.

also
4. For the reasons given in R.A. 47/96, we find no good ground to allow this Review Application and it is accordingly rejected. Let a copy of the order in RA 47/96 be also placed in this case.


(R.K. Ahooja)
Member(A)


(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member(J)

'SRD'