

for making him acting Director, CIFA by quashing Annexure A/1 dated 25.6.95 has become infructuous.

For the reasons given above, this O.A. is dismissed as being infructuous. There is no order as to costs.

Free copies of order dt. 30.7.02 may be handed over to counsel for both sides.

In
28/8

07/08/02
SD

On Memo

MA. #722/03 filed by Mr. Counsel for petition for appropriate orders; copy has been served.
(Disp. of matter)

In
29/8

Bench

or. dt. 30.10.03

MA. #722/03 for modification of order.
(Disp. matter)
for further orders.

In
29/8

Bench

Sunil Kumar Hajra
MEMBER (ADMINISTRATIVE)

T. Narayanan
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

30.10.03

On the prayer of Mr. S.B.
Sen, call on 6.11.03.

Sub
Vice Chairman 3/11
to
Member (S)

6.11.03

I heard both sides on H.A. 722/03 which has been filed to review our order dated 30.7.02 passed in this O.A., although the prayer made therein is to modify the said order. Even though the H.A. is treated to be a Review Application, the same having been filed on 26.9.03 seeking review/modification of the order dated 30.7.02, i.e. after a period of more than one year is set by laches and limitations. Apart from the above, the scope of the Tribunal to review its own order in a manner as prayed for by the applicant in the

NOTES OF THE REGISTRY

ORDERS OF THE TRIBUNAL

Dr. 27. 6-11-03

Copies of order
prepared for counsel
for both side.

Mr
M.P.

DRM
6-11-03
do

present case, application being
not in-conformity or consistency with
the Act and Rules making provision
of review, then, M.A. in our considered
view is wholly misconceived and
accordingly the same is rejected.

J. N.
Vice-Chairman

J.
Secretary