

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

Review Application No. 353 of 1992
IN

O.A.No.1483 of 1991

Date of Decision: 4.5.93.

Union of India Applicant,
versus

Shyam Singh Respondents

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice-Chairman,
Hon'ble Mr.S.R.Adige, Member(A)

For the applicant:

Shri M.L.Verma, Counsel.

JUDGMENT(ORAL)

(By Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K.Dhaon, Vice-Chairman)

This is an application praying that the order passed by this Tribunal on 31.1.92 finally disposing of O.A.No.1483 of 1991, may be reviewed.

2. The order of this tribunal is a detailed one wherein all aspects have been considered. The Tribunal may have passed an erroneous order but that will not be a ground for review. It cannot be said that the order sought to be reviewed suffers from any error apparent on the face of record. No ground, therefore, exists for interference.

3. The other contention raised is that the order of this Tribunal i.e. 31.1.92 runs counter to the another order of this Tribunal passed on 27.2.92. Be that ^{as} it may, the order dated 27.2.92 is subsequent one. It cannot be said that the tribunal has committed any error apparent on the face of record.

4. The review ^{application} was presented before this Tribunal on 24.8.92. It is supported by an application seeking condonation of delay. In the application, it is asserted that the copy of order dated 31.1.92 was served upon the respondents on 17.2.92. In paragraph 3, the averment made are these:-

"There is a good ground for accepting the review application and the delay has been caused inadvertent."

by different departments and Ministeries,
so the delay was taking place."

5. The allegations made in paragraph 3 are as ~~being~~ ^{vacant} as they could possibly be. No definite date has been indicated as to when the last competent authority perused the order and recorded his opinion that the review application be presented. It is to be noted that the normal period for filing review application is 30 days from the date of the order. However, in this case 30 days may be computed from 17.2.92. The ~~14~~ application is barred by time, and no application has ~~been made for condoning the delay.~~

6. The application is rejected summarily.

Arifclig
(S.R. ADIGE)
MEMBER (A)

Suy
(S.K. DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN (J)

(ug)