

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI.**

RA No.352/93  
MP No.3042/93 in  
OA No.1927/91

Date of decision: 18/10/93

**Shri Attar Singh** . . .

**Applicant**

vs.

Commissioner of Police,  
Delhi. ...

### Respondent

**CORAM:**

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.K.DHAON, VICE-CHAIRMAN(J)  
THE HON'BLE MR.B.N.DHOUNDIYAL, MEMBER(A)

ORDER (IN CIRCULATION)

This is an application seeking the review of our judgement dated 15.7.1993. On that day, the applicant (Sh.Attar Singh) was represented by Shri A.S.Grewal, Advocate and he made his submissions in support of the OA. The judgement was dictated in the open Court and in the presence of the learned counsel for the applicant.

2. This application has been presented by Shri B.S.Mainee, Advocate, who it appears has been engaged by the applicant for the first time merely for the purpose of presenting the review application.

3. Our judgement is a detailed one. We have perused the contents of the review application and we are satisfied that our judgement does not suffer from any error apparent on the face of the record so as to attract the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC in which our powers to review our judgements are circumscribed.

4. The review application is supported by an application seeking condonation of delay. In the said application, it is stated that a copy of our judgement dated 15.7.1993 was sent to the counsel for the applicant on 26.7.1993. When the applicant contacted his counsel, he was advised

*(Signature)* (11)

to file a review application which was drafted and typed on 23.8.1993. The same was to be signed by the applicant and filed in the Tribunal on 26.8.1993. The applicant could not contact his counsel for signing the application and the affidavit in support of the application on account of his busy schedule in his duties which he had been performing from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. continuously. The applicant got rest only on a Sunday. The petitioner could not get the affidavit attested before 21.9.1993 and, therefore, the application was filed on 22.9.1993.

5. On a perusal of the RA, we find that the same was presented on 24.9.1993. On 27.9.1993, the Registry pointed out certain defects and the review application was taken back by the applicant. It was refiled on 30.9.1993. We have carefully considered the question of condonation of delay and we are satisfied that no satisfactory explanation has been offered by the applicant for not filing the RA within the time. According to applicant's own case, the application was drafted and typed on 23.8.1993. The applicant is required to explain each day's delay after expiry of 30 days from the date of receipt of the order. We, therefore, dismiss the application seeking condonation of delay.

6. This review application fails and is dismissed summarily.

*B.N.Dhundiyal*  
(B.N.DHOUNDIYAL)  
MEMBER(A)

*S.K.Dhaon*  
(S.K.DHAON)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN(J)

SNS