

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex(BDA)
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 15 APR 1988

REVIEW APPLICATION NO 46 / 88
IN APPLICATION NO. 2047/86(F)
W.P. NO. /

Applicant

Shri R. Nagaraja Rao

To

v/s

Respondent
The Secy, Central Board of Direct Taxes,
& another

1. Shri R. Nagaraja Rao
134, 'Ramkripa'
HAL Layout I Stage
Geddalahalli
Sanjayanagar
Bangalore - 560 024

2. Shri S. Ranganatha Jois
Advocate
36, 'Vagdevi'
Shankarapuram
Bangalore - 560 004

Subject : SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~EXAMINER~~
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Review application on 6-4-88.

For-Subash
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

Encl : As above

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE SIXTH DAY OF APRIL, 1988

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S.Puttaswamy ...Vice-Chairman
Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan ...Member (A)

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.46/88

R. Nagaraja Rao,
Tax Assistant, Circle II,
Assessment 5, Income-tax
Department, Unity Buildings
Annexe, Bangalore.

Applicant

(Sri S. Ranganath Jois.....Advocate)
Vs.

The Secretary,
Central Board of Direct Taxes,
NEW DELHI

The Commissioner of Income-tax,
Karnataka I, Bangalore.

Respondents

This application has come up for hearing
before this Tribunal to-day, Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan,
Member (A), made the following :

O R D E R

This application in which the applicant wants
us to review the order passed by this Tribunal in
A.No.2047 of 1986 on 24-9-1987 has come up for
admission before us to-day.

2. We have heard Sri S. Ranganath Jois, learned
counsel for the applicant.

3. We find that the review application is badly
delayed by 155 days and no reasonable cause has been
urged for this delay, which would justify our
condoning the same. On this ground itself, the
review application deserves to be rejected. However,
the application is also devoid of merit. The applicant
has not pointed out any error apparent on the face



// 2 //

of the record nor has he averred that any documents which he could not with reasonable diligence produce at the time of hearing which has relevance to the decision of the application has now become available. In this view, no case for review has been made out by the applicant and the application is, therefore, rejected without notice to the respondents.



Sd/-

(K.S. PUTTASWAMY) 6/7/12
VICE-CHAIRMAN

Sd/-

(P.SRINIVASAN)
MEMBER (A)

TRUE COPY

R. Venkatesh
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JDL)
6/7/12
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE