

Date	Office Report	Orders (20)
		<p>R.A.34/95 & M.A.304/95 in O.A. 2782/91</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>13.9.95</u></p> <p>We have carefully considered the facts as outlined in our order dated 5.9.95.</p> <p>2. Shri B.B.Srivastava in his affidavit dated 16.5.95 has stated that the applicant had telephoned from Bulgaria that he wanted to withdraw the O.A. He understood the matter as instructions to withdraw the O.A. and accordingly made a submission dated 7.11.94.</p> <p>3. In the light of the contents of Shri B.B.Srivastava's affidavit, it cannot be said that there is any error apparent on the face of the record in the Tribunal's impugned order dated 7.11.94, because ^{by} that order the O.A. was dismissed as withdrawn owing to the fact that under instructions from his client, the applicant's counsel Shri B.B.Srivastava ^{himself} had sought permission to withdraw the O.A.</p> <p>4. The scope of a revision application is limited by the conditions set forth in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, and none of those conditions are manifested in this case.</p> <p>5. Under the circumstances, this review application is rejected leaving it open to the applicant to reagitate the matter through a fresh original proceedings, if so advised and if admissible according to law.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><i>A. Veda Valli</i></p> <p>(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)</p> <p>MEMBER (J)</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><i>S.R. Adige</i></p> <p>(S.R. ADIGE)</p> <p>MEMBER (A)</p> </div> </div>