

**THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
LUCKNOW BENCH**

Review Application No.39/2008

In

Original Application No.138/2008

This the 20th day of November 2008.

HON'BLE MR. M. KANTHAIAH, MEMBER (J)

HON'BLE DR. A.K. MISHRA, MEMBER (A)

Bajrangi Tiwari, aged about 59 years, S/o Late Shri Ram Tiwari, Programme Executive, Prasar Bharti Broadcasting Corporation of India, Akashvani, Lucknow.

...Applicant.

By Advocate: Shri S.N. Pandey.

Versus.

1. Director General, Prasar Bharti Akashvani Bhawan, Sansad Marg, Lucknow.
2. Director, Prasar Bharti, Akashvani, 18, Vidhan Sabha Marg, Lucknow.

.... Respondents.

By Advocate: None.

ORDER

BY HON'BLE MR. M. KANTHAIAH, MEMBER (J)

The applicant has filed the petition seeking review of the order of this Tribunal Dt. 15.09.2008 passed in OA on the ground the he attended the office regularly but the authorities have not obeyed the

orders of this Tribunal and further his transfer order was passed against the transfer policy and as such, he prayed to allow his OA with a direction to the respondents to pay his salary w.e.f. 26.05.2007 to 29.10.2007 with 18 % interest thereon.

2. The matter has been taken under Circulation.

3. The admitted facts of the case are that the applicant had filed OA to set aside the impugned order Dt. 30.1.2008 (Ann.A-1) compelling the applicant to submit an application for leave for payment of his salary w.e.f. 26.05.2007 to 29.10.2007 with 18 % interest thereon. After exchange of pleadings and after hearing both sides, this Tribunal passed order on 15.09.2008 with the result of dismissal of OA. Thereafter, the applicant has filed this petition to review the order of this Tribunal and allow his claim on the ground that he attended the office regularly but the authorities did not allow him to join and also on the ground that his transfer was illegal etc. The grounds taken in this review application are also the grounds in his OA and this Tribunal had considered all those points while deciding the OA, but by way of this review application the applicant wants to re-agitate the same pleas and sought prayer to reconsider his claim which is within the ^l preview of appeal but not within the scope of review application.

4. The scope of review is very limited and by way of review one can seek the review of judgment and order in respect of any typographical mistake, error on the face of the record or calculation mistake but not by way of re-adjudicating the case afresh and as such,

the claim of the applicant for review of the order and judgment Dt. 15.09.2008 of this Tribunal is not at all maintainable and thus, liable for dismissal.

In the result, the review application is rejected. No costs.


(DR. A.K. MISHRA)
MEMBER (A)


(M. KANTHAIAH)
MEMBER (J)

20.11.08

/ak/