

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

R.A. No. 32 of 2001  
in  
C.P. No. 326 of 2000  
O.A. No. 460 of 1992

XX

New Delhi, dated this the 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2001

HON'BLE MR. S.R. ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)  
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

In the matter of:

Mrs. Lalita Kumar .. Review Applicant

Versus

Government of NCT, Delhi & Ors. ... Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

S.R. ADIGE, VC (A)

Perused the R.A.

2. For an R.A. to be entertained under the provisions of Section 22 (3)(f) A.T. Act read with Order 47 Rule 1 C.P.C., there must be an error or mistake apparent on the body of the order dated 18.12.2000 or alternatively applicant should have discovered some new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time the decision/order was passed, or for any other sufficient, meaning analogous, reason.

3. No error apparent on the face of the Tribunal's order dated 18.12.2000 has been mentioned in the R.A. Till the respondents are actually held to be contemnors, they can only be referred to as alleged contemnors. Discovery of any new and

✓X5

reason has not been spelt out specifically and clearly in the R.A. Neither the applicant nor her counsel appeared even on second call when the C.P. came up for hearing on 16.12.2000. Even otherwise, there are no valid and tenable grounds for allowing the R.A. as already noted supra.

4. R.A. is, therefore, rejected.

A. Vedavalli

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)  
Member (J)

S.R. Adige  
(S.R. Adige)  
Vice Chairman (A)

'gk'