

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.

RA No.102/93

Date of order: 23.07.1993.

OA No.1475/90

Smt. Pratima Pal & Ors. Applicants

versus

Union of India & Ors. Respondents

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon, Vice-Chairman

The Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A)

For the review petitioners : Sh. B.L. Madhok, proxy
counsel for Sh.B.S.Mainee,
counsel

ORDER(ORAL)

(delivered by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K. Dhaon,
Vice-Chairman)

The judgement given by a two Member Bench of this Tribunal of which one of us (Hon'ble Sh. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member(A) was a member in O.A.No.1475/90 on 16.02.1993 is sought to be reviewed by means of this application.

The applicant, inter-alia, relies upon the decision given by a Bench of this Tribunal in the case of one Ms. Vidya Gupta. This Tribunal considered the case of Ms. Vidya Gupta and felt that the same was

3

..2..

JK 17

distinguishable. The argument, in substance, is that Ms. Vidya Gupta's case was applicable to him and is not distinguishable.

erred.
The Bench may have ~~heard~~. However, every error committed by a Court cannot be reviewed. The power of review is contained in Order XLVII Rule 1 of C.P.C., which is applicable to this Tribunal. None of the provisions under order XLVII Rule 1 are applicable to the facts of the present case. We see no ground to review the judgement dated 16.2.1993.

The present review application is rejected.

B.N. Dhaundiyal
(B.N. Dhaundiyal)

Member(A)

S.K. Dhaon
(S.K. Dhaon)

Vice-Chairman

/vv/

23.07.93