

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD.

Review Application no. 94 of 1996  
in  
Original Application no. 505 of 1995.

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Administrative Member.

Smt. Lalpatti Devi

... Applicant.

C/A Sri S.K. Dey,  
Sri S.K. Mishra.

Versus

Union of India

... Respondent.

C/R ...

ORDER

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member-A.

This is a review petition under section 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) rules, 1987. This review petition has been filed for review of order in O.A. 505 of 1995 dated 31.07.96.

2. The order was ready on 13.08.96 and was received on 14.08.97 as stated in this review petition no. 94 of 1996.

3. The applicant in review who was also applicant in OA 505/95 has sought review because:-

...2/-

...2/-

// 2 //

- i. the respondents concealed the facts contained in Railway Board's letter dated 29.12.76 which has extended the period for making request for pension.
- ii. applicability of ratio of OA no. 16 of 1991 decided on 09.07.93.
- iii. misleading averments of the respondents.

4. The judgment in OA 505 of 1995 has been given on merits of the case and the judgment clearly mentions that the applicant chose to approach the Tribunal after nearly five years of having accepted exgratia pension. Therefore, the application for review is misconceived and dismisses as non maintainable.

  
Member-A

/pc/



CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ALLAHABAD BENCH  
ALLAHABAD.

Review Application no. 94 of 1996  
in  
Original Application no. 505 of 1995.

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Administrative Member

Smt. Lalpatti Devi ... Applicant

C/A Sri S.K. Dey,  
Sri S.K. Mishra.

Versus

Union of India... Respondent.

C/R ...

ORDER

Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, Member-A.

This is a review petition under section 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) rules, 1987. This review petition has been filed for review of order in O.A. 505 of 1995 dated 31.07.96.

2. The order was ready on 13.08.96 and was received on 14.08.97 as stated in this review petition on 94 of 1996.

3. The applicant in review who was also applicant in OA 505/95 has sought review because:-

1. the respondents concealed the facts contained in Railway Boards' letter dated 29.12.76 which has extended the period for <sup>making request for</sup> obtaining pension.

// 2 //

ii. applicability of ratio of QA no. 16 of 1991 decided on 09.07.93.

iii. misleading averments of the respondents.

4. The judgment in QA 505 of 1995 has been given on merits of the case and the judgment clearly mentions that the applicant chooses to approach the Tribunal after nearly five years of having accepted exgratia pension. Therefore, the application for review is misconceived and dismissed as non maintainable.

Member-A

/pc/