

3  
BY CIRCULATION

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH,  
ALLAHABAD.

Dated: Allahabad, the 30th day of July, 2001.

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, AM

Hon'ble Mr. Rafiq Uddin, JM

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 24 OF 2001

On behalf of

Commandant,  
Central Ordnance Depot,  
Cheoki, Allahabad.

.... Applicant

IN

REGISTERED O. A. NO. 1334 OF 1993

Alley Yaseen,  
C & D/2152 Mazdoor Stock Taking Branch,  
Central Ordnance Depot, Cheoki, Allahabad  
son of Mohd. Haroon,  
r/o village & Post Office Dandupur,  
District Allahabad.

.... Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through Director,  
General Ordnance Branch,  
Army HQ, New Delhi.
2. Officer In-charge, Army Ordnance  
Corps (Records) Secunderabad.
3. Commandant, Central Ordnance Depot,  
Cheoki, Allahabad.

.... Respondents

ORDER

(BY CIRCULATION)

(By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, AM)

4-

This Review Petition has been examined by us under rules of circulation.

2. The applicant in this review petition was respondent in the O.A.

3. The narration in review petition reads as if the respondents consider the review as second opportunity to present ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> case. The purpose of review is not to furnish a second opportunity to the parties to state their case on merits after the judgment has been pronounced. The purpose of review is only to correct any error which is apparent on the face of record or permit introduction of new facts, which have vital bearing on the case and were not available to the parties, despite due diligence at the time they had presented their case earlier.

4. In the instant review petition, the applicant who was respondent earlier has sought to justify the action of the respondent in operating only a part of the select-list drawn by the respondents earlier by ignoring candidates recommended at Sl. Nos. 1, 2 and 3 in the select list and supporting the appointments already made to candidates, who were at Sl. Nos. 4, 5 and 6 in the select list. We had found such an action of the respondent totally arbitrary.

5. We find that this review petition is without any merit. Since it has delayed the confirmation of benefit granted to the applicant in the O.A., we direct the respondent No. 3 to pay Rs. 1,000/- to the applicant by way of compensation.

*Rafiq Uddin* *S. Dayal*  
 (RAFIQ UDDIN) (S. DAYAL)  
 MEMBER (J) MEMBER (A)

Nath/