

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
Principal Bench

25

R.A. No. 42 of 1996  
in  
O.A. No. 1653 of 1991

New Delhi, dated the 8 April, 1996

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

Shri B.K. Bali,  
S/o Shri G.S. Bali,  
No.203, Sector-III,  
Sadiq Nagar,  
New Delhi-110049. .... REVIEW APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the  
Secretary,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
New Delhi.
2. The Director,  
Intelligence Bureau,  
Ministry of Home Affairs,  
North Block,  
New Delhi. .... RESPONDENTS

ORDER (By Circulation)

BY HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

We have perused the R.A.

2. Under Section 22(3) (f) A.T. Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. an order/judgment/decision of the Tribunal can be reviewed only if

any mistake or

- (i) it suffers from/an error apparent on the face of the record;
- (ii) new material or evidence is discovered which was not within the knowledge of the parties or could not be produced by that party at the time the judgment was made, despite due diligence; or other
- (iii) for any / sufficient reason construed to mean analogous grounds.

26

3. From a perusal of the contents of the R.A. it is manifest that none of the grounds contained therein brings it within the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC as defined above.

4. In fact in the guise of an R.A. the applicant has sought to re-argue the entire case and has once again advanced the same grounds which were considered and rejected in the impugned judgment.

5. No cause for reviewing the judgment is made out. The R.A. is dismissed.

A. Vedavalli

(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)  
Member (J)

S. R. Adige  
(S. R. ADIGE)  
Member (A)

/GK/