

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH

\*\*\*\*\*

Commercial Complex(BDA),  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 21 JAN 1987

Review Application No. 28/86( )

In A.No

~~XXXXXX~~

194/86(T)

Applicant

Director of Telecommunications, Karnataka Circle & " Ors  
To

1. Sh M.Vasudeva Rao,  
Addl Central Govt Standing Counsel,  
High Court Buildings, Bangalore-1.
2. Director of Telecommunications,  
Karnataka Circle, Bangalore-1.
3. The General Manager,  
Telecommunications,  
Karnataka Circle, Bangalore-1.
4. The Chairman,  
Posts and Telegraphs,  
New Delhi.
5. Sh SG Kulkarni,  
Naganur, Via-Mudlichi,  
Gokak Taluk, Belgaum Distt.

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH IN

Review APPLICATION NO. 28/86( )

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order ~~XXXXX~~  
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on 03-12-1986.

Encl : as above.

*[Signature]*  
SECTION OFFICER  
(JUDICIAL)

Balu\*

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

BANGALORE BENCH BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 3RD DECEMBER 1986

Justice

Present: Hon'ble Shri/K.S. Puttaswamy,

Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan,

Member (A)

Application No. 28/1986

1. Director of Telecommunication,  
Karnataka Circle,  
Bangalore-1.
2. The General Manager,  
Telecommunication,  
Karnataka Circle, Bangalore-1,
3. The Chairman,  
Posts and Telegraphs,  
New Delhi.

Applicants

(Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, Advocate)  
Vs.

S.G. Kulkarni,  
S/o G.A. Kulkarni, Major,  
Naganur, Via-Mudligi,  
Gokak Taluk, Belgaum District

Respondents

This application has come up for hearing before  
this Tribunal to-day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

O R D E R

In this application made U/s 22(3)(F) of the  
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicants  
who were the respondents in A.No. 194/86, have  
sought for a review of our order made on 4.9.1986  
in that application .

2. In our order dated 4.9.1986, we have set out  
the facts of the case, considered the contentions  
urged before us, and allowed the application made  
by the respondent.



3. We heard the case on 4.9.1986 and dicated our order in open Court in the presence of both the parties and their learned counsel, noticing every one of the contentions urged before us.


4. In reality and in substance, the applicants are asking us to re-examine our order, as if we are sitting in an appeal against our own order, which is impermissible in a review. We cannot, therefore, admit this application at all. We do not also find any error, which is apparent on the face of the record to justify us to review our order. We, therefore, reject this application in limini.



81 -  
(K.S. PUTTASWAMY)  
VICE-CHAIRMAN  
3.12.86

8d -  
(P. SRINIVASAN)  
MEMBER (A)  
3.12.86

/ TRUE COPY /

  
SECTION OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE

~~SECTION OFFICER~~  
~~CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL~~  
~~ADDITIONAL BENCH~~  
~~BANGALORE~~