

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

AHMEDABAD BENCH

M.A.No.300/94 & M.A.No.301/94

in
R.A.No. 21 OF 1994 in

O.A. NO. 76 of 1992.

~~T.A. NO.~~

DATE OF DECISION 27-7-94.

Union of India & Ors.

Petitioner s

(Orig.respondents No.1&2)

Mr. R.M. Vin,

Advocate for the Petitioner (s)

Versus

Labhshankar Bhayabhai Teraiya &
Anrs.

Respondents

(Orig. applicants)

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. V. Radhakrishnan, Admn. Member.

The Hon'ble Mr.

JUDGMENT

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

1) Union of India
through the General Manager,
Western Railway,
Churchgate, Bombay.

2) Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Bhavnagar Division,
Bhavnagar Para
Bhavnagar.

(Advocate: Mr. R.M. Vin)

..... Applicant
(Orig. respondents
No. 1 & 2 in O.A.)

Versus.

1) Labhshankar Bhayabhai Teraiya,

2) Rasiklal Labhshankar Teraiya

Both residing at Railway Quarter

No. 23/M 'A' Type,

Dhola Junction.

..... Opponents
(Orig. applicants)

Decision by circulation.

ORDER

M.A.No.300/1994

and

M.A.No.301/94

in

R.A.No. 21/1994

in

O.A.No. 76/1992

Date: 27-7-94.

Per: Hon'ble Mr.V.Radhakrishnan, Admn. Member.

The order of the Tribunal was delivered on
7.3.1994. The review application has been filed on
1/2-6-1994. Accordingly the review application is
time barred. No sufficient reasons explaining the
delay have been brought out in the M.A. for
condonation of this delay. I see no reason for

- 3 -

condonation of delay. Hence M.A. 300/94 is rejected,
as M.A. is rejected, R.A. does not survive. M.A.301/94
filed by the applicant for stay of judgment and
extension of time is also rejected.



(V.Radhakrishnan)
Member (A)

vtc.