

22

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEWDELHI**

**R.A. NO.256/2005,
M.A. Nos.2357/2005 & 2365/2005
IN
O.A. NO. 2057/2004**

New Delhi, this the 27th day of December, 2005

HON'BLE MR. MUKESH KUMAR GUPTA, MEMBER (J)

Narendra Kumar Singh,
Aged about 23 years,
Son of Late Smt. Shakuntala Kumari,
Ex-Clerk, N.Rly. Tundla,
R/o Village Sailai,
Post & Distt. Firozabad (U.P.)

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Union of India Thro'
The Chairman, Railway Board,
Ex-Officio Principal Secretary,
Govt. of India, Ministry of Railway,
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
2. The General Manager,
Northern Railway, Baroda House,
New Delhi
3. The General Manager,
North Central Railway,
Allahabad
4. The Divisional Railway Manager,
North Central Railway,
Allahabad

... RESPONDENTS

ORDER (By Circulation)

MA 2357/2005

By the present MA, the Petitioner seeks condonation of delay in filing the Review Application, stating that there had been some mistake in the calculation of limitation period, which was not deliberate or to gain undue advantage.

f

MA 2365/2005

2. By this MA, a prayer is made to hear the RA through the Petitioner's counsel.

RA 256/2005

3. By the present Review Application No. 256 of 2005, the petitioner seeks review and recall of an order dated 26.9.2005, stating that the order of dismissal has been secured by the respondents by playing fraud on the Tribunal and the said order was passed without perusing the original record.

4. I have carefully perused the order sought to be recalled, which is an oral order dictated in the open court and in the presence of the counsel. At the outset, it had been noticed therein "since the original records have been produced by the respondents, no order is called for." As noticed hereinabove, the basic ground urged in support of the R.A. is that the original records were not produced and, therefore, there is an error apparent on the face of record in the said order dated 26.9.2005. I have carefully perused the RA as well as the order sought to be reviewed. It is unfortunate that the applicant has made allegation and raised contention that original records were not produced though the order in question specifically noticed that such original records were produced by the respondents. Therefore, there is no error apparent on the face of the record in the said order dated 26.9.2005.


5. I have carefully perused MA 2365/2005. Under the provisions of rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987, unless ordered by the Bench, a Review Application is to be disposed of "by circulation". On perusal of the MA, I find no justification in acceding to the

94

request made that the present RA be heard through his counsel.

Accordingly, the said MA is rejected.

6. In view of the above, RA No.256/2005 as well as MA No.2357/2005 are dismissed in circulation.



(Mukesh Kumar Gupta)
Member (J)

/pkr/