

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Principal Bench

25

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

New Delhi, dated the 8th 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.
- 1

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. Veda Valli

(DR. A. VEDAVALLI)
Member (J)

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

/GK/