

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ALLAHABAD BENCH,
ALLAHABAD

Dated : Allahabad this the 11th day of Sept. 1996

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. T. L. Verma, J.M.
Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 98 of 1995

on behalf of
Union of India and others.....applicants.
in

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 753 of 1994.

Vinod Behari Singh.....petitioner/applicant.

Versus

Union of India and others....Respondents.

O_R_D_E_R
(By Hon'ble Mr. T.L.Verma, Member-J)

This application has been filed to review the order dated 31.3.1995 passed in O.A.No. 753 of 1994.

2. The aforesaid O.A. was filed for quashing order dated 11.4.1994 whereby the applicant in the O.A. was ordered to be reverted to the post of Luscar and for issuing a direction to the respondents to allow the applicant to continue on the post of Hindi Typist to which he has been promoted.

.....contd. 2/---

2. The aforesaid O.A. was allowed and the impugned order reverting the applicant to the post of Luscar was quashed. It was held that the applicant is entitled to pay and allowances for the ~~xx~~ entire period from the date of his promotion. The respondents were therefore, directed to pay the arrears of pay and allowances to him if he has not already paid during the pendency of the application.

3. It is well settled that power of review may be exercised :-

- i. On the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking review or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made.
- ii. Where some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found and,
- iii. Any other analogous ground.

4. We have perused the review application and also the order dated 11.4.1994 rendered in O.A.No.753 of 1994. The review application does not disclose whether any important matter or evidence, which after exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge or could not be produced at the time when the case was argued, has been discovered or that mistake or error apparent on the face of record has been found justifying interference with the order in exercise of review jurisdiction.

5. In view of the above, we find no merit in this review application and dismiss the same accordingly.