(2)

By Circulation

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH, ALLAHABAD.

DATED THIS THE 9th DAY OF August 1999

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal, A.M.

Hon'ble Mr.S.L. Jain, J.M.

Review Application No. 03 of 1999

in

Original Application No. 383 of 1997

For Review of judgment

on behalf of

Union of India and others . . Applicants.
(Counsel for the Applicants:- Sri N.B. Singh Ad.)

in

O.A. 383 of 1997.

District Allahabad.

Uma Shankar and others . . Applicants.

Versus

Union of India and others . . Respondents.

Order

(By Hon'ble Mr. S. Dayal,Member (A)

This review application hasbeen filed seeking review of order in O.A. 383/1997 dated 9.12.98. Along with other directions, a direction was given to respondents to pay compensation to applicants of Rs.3000/- each. The review of this part of the order is sought by the applicants in this Review Application who were respondents in O.A. 383 of 1997.

2. The review is sought on the ground that the compensation could not havebeen awarded as there was no loss incurred by the applicants as the selection was set aside. The second ground is that

Sri N.B. Singh Adv.
C.A.T. ALLAHABAD

the compensation could not have been awarded because there was no power conferred by any statute or rules for grant of compensation by the Tribunal. Another ground which has been taken is that since the selection had been held to be illegal, there was no question of granting compensation. Lastly it is contended that the amount of Rs.3000/- each as compensation was excessive.

3. The order of the Tribunal waspronounced on 9.12.98 and the copies were ready on 15.12.98 yet the review application has been filed on 28.1.99. However, since the date of filing is mentioned as 08.1.99 the review application has been treated to be within time.

4. Review of an order would be permissible under the law for any error apparent on the face of the record or for non consideration of any evidence which was no available, at the time the order was passed, with the parties even if they had exercised due diligence in trying to obtain such evidence. There is no such contention made by the applicants in review. They appear to seek review on the ground that the order is defective and should, therefore, be reviewed. Since the order has been passed after considering the facts and merits of the case, the same can be reviewed by us under the law.

5. The review application is,, therefore, dismissed as lacking in merits.

Member (J.) Member (A.)

Nafees.