

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

R.A.-106/91 In
O.A. No. 588/91
T.A. No.

199

DATE OF DECISION 16/7/1991

Smt. Sudershan Kumari

Petitioner

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & Others

Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (Judl.)

The Hon'ble Mr. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Administrative Member.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? *Yes*
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? *No*
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? *No*
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal?

(Judgement delivered by Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha,
Vice-Chairman)

The petitioner in this Review Application is the original applicant in DA-588/91 which was disposed of by judgement dated 3.5.1991. In its judgement, the Tribunal came to the conclusion that this is not a fit case in which a direction should be issued to the respondents to appoint the applicant on compassionate grounds. In the interest of justice and equity, it was also directed that the applicant shall not be dispossessed of the Government accommodation upto 31st August, 1991, subject to her making payment of monthly rent in accordance with the relevant rules.

2

2. After going through the R.A. carefully, we do not see any error apparent on the face of the judgement. The applicant has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement. It may be that the applicant is aggrieved by the decision. In that event, the proper course for her would be to prefer an appeal in the Supreme Court and not to reagitate the ~~matter~~ ² ~~matter~~ by filing a review application. The application is, therefore, rejected.

B.N.Dhundiyal
(B.N. Dhoundiyal)
Administrative Member

Parvez
(P.K. Kartha)
Vice-Chairman(Judl.)