

X 100  
5

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH, DELHI.

R.A. 265/92 in CCP 230/91      DATE OF DECISION: 31.7.1992.  
(O.A. No.1181/1990).

Gursewak Singh Sodhi      ....      Applicant.

V/s.

Shri P. Anantha Krishnan  
and Shri K.S. Dhingra      ....      Respondents.

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.S. Malimath, Chairman.  
Hon'ble Mr. P.C. Jain, Member (A).

(By Circulation)

This Review Application has been filed by the petitioner in CCP 230/91, which was disposed of by the following order dated 21.4.92: -

" After this case was heard for sometime, we feel that the only proper way to dispose of this Contempt of Court petition is to direct the respondents to pay the petitioner the salary for the months of April and May, 1990 as per the judgment of the Tribunal a sum of Rs.4,896/- by means of a draft / a cheque drawn in favour of the petitioner and send the same to his address within 2 weeks from this date.

" This CCP stands disposed of with these directions."

This Review Application also makes a reference of M.P. 4186/91, which had already been rejected by order dated 14.2.1992.

2. In this R.A., the applicant has made the following prayers: -

- (a) The petitioner be heard on aspects of perjury ex-parte against Shri Anantha Krishnan.
- (b) The Court may be pleased to initiate suo moto contempt proceedings against Shri Anantha Krishnan for non-compliance of orders passed on 14.2.92, 13.3.92 and 21.4.92.
- (c) The Court may be pleased to pass orders on contempt against Shri Dhingra for breach of the undertaking and stipulating condition on payment of salary and for disputing payment of salary before the D.R. since he has been found guilty by the Court vide its order of 21.4.92.

3. Of the grounds taken by the applicant, two relate to the question of alleged perjury, which was a subject-matter of M.P. 4186/91 and which, as already stated above, was rejected by order dated 14.2.1992. This Review Application in respect of the order on the aforesaid M.P. is clearly barred by limitation prescribed in Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987. The other grounds taken in the R.A. relate mainly to the contempt alleged to have been committed by Shri Dhingra and Shri Anantha Krishnan. Two of the prayers in this R.A. relate to this aspect of the matter and seek for initiating suo-moto contempt proceedings and passing fresh orders on contempt, which are outside the scope of a Review Application. Another ground taken is that the Court by relying on the false record prepared by Shri Anantha Krishnan "delivered an atrocious and pernicious judgment". Less said the better about the language used by the applicant in this regard.

4. After careful perusal of the R.A., we are of the considered view that the same is devoid of any merit and it is accordingly rejected.

(P.C. JAIN)  
MEMBER(A)

(V.S. MALIMATH)  
CHAIRMAN.