

Three

150

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.61/95
MA No.553/95
RA No.62/95 in
OA No.1444/91

Hon'ble Shri A.V.Haridasan, Vice-Chairman(J)
Hon'ble Shri R.K.Ahooja, Member(A)

New Delhi, this 13th day of July, 1995

The Commissioner of Police Delhi
Delhi Police Headquarters
M.S.O.Building
I.P.Estate
New Delhi.

Additional Commissioner of Police
(Administration) Delhi
Delhi Police Headquarters
M.S.O.Building
I.P.Estate
New Delhi.

Deputy Commissioner of Police (HDCRS-I)
Delhi Police Headquarters
M.S.O. Building, I.P.Estate
New Delhi.

... Applicants

(By Shri Jog Singh, Advocate)

Versus

Shri Sunder Singh,
Constable No.11413/DAP
1077/NE
r/o Quarter/Barrack
Police Station Seemapuri
Delhi.

(By Shri Shyam Babu, Advocate)

ORDER(Oral).

Hon'ble Shri A.V.Haridasan, Vice-Chairman(J)

The Review Application No.61/95 has been filed by the original respondents in the OA No.1444/91 for review of the Judgment dated 26.7.1994. As this RA has been filed after the expiry of the period prescribed in Rule-17 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, Miscellaneous Application No.553/95 has been filed by the Union of India for having the delay condoned. In the MA (supra) for condonation of delay, it has been averred that as the legal advisor retired from service at look him, to have the matter processed and to file the RA. This prima facie does not disclose any satisfactory ground for having the delay condoned.

3

We have gone through the Review Application. The only ground stated in the Review Application is that a different view was taken in a similar case decided on 28.10.1994 (in OA No.1414 & 1415/94, Shri Rooplal & Khadag Singh vs. Delhi Administration & Others) and therefore, in the light of this development, the order in this case is liable to be reviewed.

2. It has also been contended in para V of the Review Application that the nature of duties performed by a Constable in B.S.F. and in Delhi Police and their pay scales are not identical or similar. The review applicant cannot put forth any new contentions in the review application. (Any of the order suffer from any error apparent on the face of records or of any important piece of evidence which if produced at the hearing would have affected the decision and if such evidence could not be produced even in spite of due diligence or for any such reasons and that a different view was taken on a subsequent date in a similar matter is not at all a ground for review of an order. Hence the RA filed by the Union of India and the MA for condonation of delay are dismissed.

3. This RA No.62/95 has been filed by the applicant, Shri Sunder Singh in the original OA No.1444/91 for additional relief which has not been granted him by the order dated 26.7.1994. It is seen that on the OA, the applicant had not prayed for this additional relief. Therefore, finding no grounds the RA also is dismissed and the MA is also dismissed. No costs.


(R.K.AHOOJA)
MEMBER(A)

/RAO/


(A.V.HARIDASAN)
VICE-CHAIRMAN(J)