

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Principal Bench

R.A. No.131 of 1997
in
O.A. No. 1055 of 1991

New Delhi, dated the ²⁶ ^{May} 1997

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

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

Shri D.S. Bhorla,
S/o Shri M.R. Bhorla,
MG-1/40, Vikaspuri,
New Delhi-110018. ... REVIEW APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Union of India through
the Secretary,
Ministry of Railways, Railway Board,
Rail Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,
North East Frontier Railway,
Maligaon,
Guwahati-7810011.
3. The Central Vigilance Commission,
through their Secretary,
Shahjahan Road,
New Delhi. ... REVIEW RESPONDENTS

Order (By Circulation)

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

Perused the R.A.

2. At the outset it is noted that the R.A. is grossly time barred and is hit by limitation. The grounds given to explain the delay in filing the R.A. are not satisfactory.

3. That apart, a perusal of the grounds taken in the R.A. make it abundantly clear that none of the same bring it within the

✓

scope and ambit of Section 22(3)(3)(f) read with Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C. under which alone any judgment/order/decision of the Tribunal can be reviewed. In the guise of an R.A. the applicant has acutally sought to appeal against the impugned judgment which is not permissible in law. The impugned judgment was a detailed and considered one delivered after hearing both parties at considerable length on merits. If applicant is dissatisfied with the impugned judgment it is open to him to challenge it in the appropriate legal forum in the manner prescribed by law. An R.A. the scope and ambit of which is extremely limited is not the appropriate instrument for the purpose.

4. Furthermore no good grounds have been made out to dispense with the procedure prescribed in Rule 17(3) C.A.T. (Procedure) Rules of disposing of this O.A. through circulation.

5. The R.A. is rejected.

A. Veda Valli

(Dr. A. VEDAVALLI)
Member (J)

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

/GK/