

92

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI

C.P. NO. 203/94 in
O.A. NO. 1334/91

New Delhi this the 9th day of November, 1994

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE S. C. MATHUR, CHAIRMAN
HON'BLE SHRI P. T. THIRUVENGADAM, MEMBER (A)

Sanjay Asija S/O M. C. Asija,
D-3, Shastri Nagar,
Meerut (U.P.)

... Applicant

By Advocate Shri Ashish Kalia

Versus

1. Shri Padma Rajjiani,
Secretary, Ministry
of Defence, South Block,
New Delhi.
2. Lt. Gen. J. S. Ahluwalia, PVSM,
Director General,
Army Headquarters,
MGO Branch, Army Hq. DHOQ,
New Delhi.
3. Maj. Gen. S. Rishi,
Commander,
Technical Group (EME),
Central Lines,
Delhi Cantt.
4. Brig. Rajesh Palta,
Commandant,
510, Army Base Workshop,
Meerut Cantt. ... Respondents

By Advocate Shri V. S. R. Krishna

ORDER (ORAL)

Shri Justice S. C. Mathur, Chairman :-

The applicant alleges disobedience by the
respondents of the Tribunal's judgment and order
dated 1.2.1993 passed in O.A. No. 1334/91.

2. A perusal of the aforesaid order shows that
at the stage of hearing, the applicants confined
their relief to disposal of "revision petitions"
which, according to them, were pending before the

1

(22)

concerned authority. The Tribunal directed that the said revision petitions be disposed of expeditiously. After the Tribunal's order, the applicant made a representation to the concerned authority for disposal of the revision petition. The concerned authority passed an order on 1.8.1994, a copy of which has been filed as Annexure-III to the reply. It is asserted by the learned counsel for the respondents that by this order, whatever was pending with the concerned authority, has been disposed of.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that by order dated 1.8.1994, the review application has been disposed of and not the revision petition. We asked the learned counsel to point out the particulars of the review application which was pending and reference to which has been made in the O.A. The learned counsel stated that a copy of the petition was filed along with the O.A. as Annexure-X. We have examined Annexure-X. That petition has not been described as a 'revision petition' but has been described as 'review petition'. It is dated 24.12.1990. In the order dated 1.8.1994, reference has been made to the review application dated 24.12.1990. The distinction between 'revision petition' and 'review petition' tried to be made by the learned counsel is wholly misconceived.

4. In view of the above, this application is rejected. Since it was made on frivolous grounds, we direct the applicant to pay costs to the respondents which are assessed at Rs. 500/-.

P. J. Dix

/as/

(P. T. Thiruvengadam)
Member (A)

J. Mathur
(S. C. Mathur)
Chairman