

18 23

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.293/97 in
OA No.2492/92

New Delhi this the 28th day of August, 1998.

HON'BLE MR. N. SAHU, MEMBER (A)
HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J)

Bikram Singh,
S/o Shri Jay Singh,
R/o 18/C, Aram Bagh,
New Delhi.

...Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Jog Singh)

-Versus-

1. Union of India,
through the Secretary,
Department of Civil Aviation,
Sardar Patel Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 001.
2. The Director (Admn),
Directorate of Supplies
and Disposal,
Jeevan Tara Building,
Parliament Street,
New Delhi-110 001.
3. The Secretary,
Department of Personnel & Training,
North Block,
New Delhi-110 001.

...Respondents

(By Advocate - None)

O R D E R

HON'BLE DR. A. VEDAVALLI, MEMBER (J) :

We have heard Shri Jog Singh, learned counsel for the review applicant. No-one was present for the respondents. They, however, have contested the Review Application and have filed their reply. We have perused the Review Application and the material papers and documents placed on record. The matter has been considered carefully.

2. The review applicant seeks a review and recall of this Tribunal's order dated 11.11.97 in OA No.2492/92 (Annexure R-1). However, we find that he

A

failed to establish clearly and specifically any error apparent on the face of the said order or any of the other grounds enumerated in Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Order XLVII, Rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, which would justify or necessitate a review and recall of the aforesaid order sought to be reviewed. He has only reiterated substantially the various averments and submissions made in the O.A. and the reliefs sought therein. A Review Application can be filed only on the limited grounds as enumerated in the aforesaid provisions as held by the Apex Court in a number of decisions, including the case of K. Ait Babu & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors. JT 1997 (7) SC 24. Moreover, the review applicant is trying to re-agitate the entire matter in his Review Application as if it is an appeal, which is clearly impermissible under the law.

3. In view of the foregoing discussion we are of the considered opinion that the Review Application is devoid of any merit and is not justified.

4. In the result, the Review Application is rejected.

A. Vedavalli

(Dr. A. Vedavalli)
Member (J)

N. Sahu

(N. Sahu)
Member (A)