

29

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

RA No.145/93 in
OA No.226/92.

Date of decision:

4.6.93

Shri K.H.N.Kanojia & ors. ... Applicants
versus
Union of India & ors. ... Respondents

CORAM:THE HON'BLE SH.I.K.RASGOTRA, MEMBER(A)
THE HON'BLE SH.J.P.SHARMA, MEMBER(J)

For the Applicants ... Sh.T.K.Sinha, Counsel.

ORDER

(BY HON'BLE SH.J.P.SHARMA, MEMBER(J))

The applicants have filed this Review Application against the judgement dated 5.2.93 by which the relief claimed by the applicants for revision of scale of Rs.1400-2600 to Rs.1640-2900 i.e. at par with the Assistants Grade of the Central Secretariat Service and Grade 'C' Stenographers of the Central Secretariat Stenographers Service was rejected.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the Review Applicants and have perused the record carefully. The Review Applicants have referred to certain authorities of the Hon'ble Supreme Court i.e. BHAGWAN DASS & ORS. (AIR 1987 SC 2049) and wanted to reopen the case. The learned counsel has tried to distinguish the authorities of V.MARKENDEYA & ORS. VS. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH (AIR 1989 SC 1308); STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ANR. VS. PRAMOD BHARTIYA & ORS. (JT 1992 (5) SC 683); and THE FEDERATION OF ALL INDIA CUSTOMS AND CENTRAL EXICSE STENOGRAPHERS VS. U.O.I & ORS. (AIR 1988 SC 1291). These juegements have been referred to in the judgement under review and the extracts from these judgements applicable to the ratio of the present case have also been incorporated.

The applicants cannot reopen the whole case in a Review Application.

3. A review lies only on an error apparent on the face of the judgement or the Review Applicant wants to point out that the finding arrived at may be varied by any other evidence which he desired to file and was not within his knowledge after exercising due diligence. This is not the case here. The Review Application is, therefore, devoid of merit and is dismissed.

J.P.Sharma
(J.P.SHARMA)
MEMBER(J)

I.K.Rasgotra
(I.K.RASGOTRA)
MEMBER(A)