

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH  
REVIEW PETITION NO:34/99 IN  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO:139/99.

HON'BLE SHRI B.N.BAHADUR, MEMBER(A).

Shri Rajan Kumar Routray  
resident of:  
Flat No.408 'B' Wing,  
"Radiant" Raheja Vihar Rowat,  
Mumbai - 400 072. ... Petitioner

By Advocate Shri P.A.Prabhakaran.

v/s.

Union of India  
through the Chairman,  
Central Board of Excise & Customs,  
Ministry of Finance,  
Department of Revenue North Block,  
New Delhi-110 001. ... Respondents.

1ST OCT 99

TRIBUNAL'S ORDER

DATED: SEPT, 99

I have carefully considered the review application. The order in the OA-139/99 which is now sought to be reviewed directed the respondent No.1 to dispose of the Memorial if not disposed of already. Now the point made by the applicant is that the Memorial had indeed been disposed of earlier, but the applicant could not come to the Court on the day of judgement i.e. 13.7.99.

2. It is not at all justifiable for the applicant to say that the OA deserves to be restored by reviewing the order dated 13/7/99. The OA had clearly anticipated the possibility of the Memorial being disposed of ~~and~~ in the meantime ~~and~~ cannot be said

B2B

B2B