

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH  
@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@

Dated : 29-6-87

IN APPLICATION NOS. 356 & 365/86(T)

W.P. NO

Secy, M/c Defence & another

V/s Shri D. Ramanath & another

1. The Secretary  
Ministry of Defence  
South Block  
New Delhi - 110 011

4. Shri D. Ramnath  
Senior Scientific Officer-II  
R.T.O. (Engrs)  
Ministry of Defence  
Bangalore

2. The Director  
Electronics & Radar Development  
Establishment  
DRDO Complex, Byrasandra Village  
Jeevanbimanagar Post  
Bangalore - 560 075

5. Shri M.R. Shivaram  
Senior Scientific Officer I  
Office of the C.R.E(Engines)  
Department of Aeronautics  
Bangalore - 560 075

3. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao  
Addl Central Govt. Stng Counsel  
High Court Bldg, Bangalore - 1

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~STAX~~/

~~XXXXXX-XXXX~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said application on 10-6-87.

SECTION OFFICER  
(JUDICIAL)

Encl : as above

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF JUNE, 1987.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, .. Vice-Chairman  
And  
Hon'ble Mr. L.H.A. Rego, .. Member(A).

REVIEW APPLICATIONS NOS. 14 AND 15 OF 1987

1. Union of India,  
represented by Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
  2. The Director,  
Electronic & Radar Development Corporation,  
Bangalore-1. .. Applicants.  
(By Sri M.V. Rao, CGASC) v.
  1. D. Ramanath,  
S/o late K.S. Devarajan,  
SSO-II, RTO (Engrs.), Ministry of Defence,  
Bangalore. .. Respondent in R.A. 14/87.
  2. M.R. Shivaram,  
SSO-I, Office of the CRE  
(Engines Dept.) of Aeronautics,  
Bangalore. .. Respondent in R.A. 15/87.
- 

These applications coming for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

In these applications made under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act'), the applicants have sought for a review of our order made in A.Nos. 356 and 365 of 1986. The applicants before us were the respondents in A.Nos. 356 and 365 of 1986 filed by each of the respondents.

2. We disposed of A.Nos. 356 and 365 of 1986 and other connected cases by our common order made on 30-10-1986.

3. Sri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned counsel for the applicants, contends that each of the respondents who had joined service on and after 5-9-1972 were not entitled for the benefit of the order made by Government on 5-9-1972 and this Tribunal in extending the benefit



of that order to them has committed an apparent error and the same justifies a review.

4. The respondents and their learned counsel who have been duly served have remained absent and are unrepresented.

5. We are of the view that every one of the submissions made by Sri Rao do not disclose an apparent error in our order. At the highest, every one of the submissions made by Sri Rao can only be said to disclose a latent error, if any, and not a patent error. If the error, if any, is only a latent error and not a patent error then we cannot review our earlier order. We need hardly say that our order governs or extends the benefit <sup>to</sup> only those that approach us and not others.

6. In the light of our above discussion, we hold that these applications are liable to be dismissed. We, therefore, dismiss these applications. But, in the circumstances of the cases, we direct the parties to bear their own costs.



Sd/-

VICE-CHAIRMAN

19/6/87

Sd/-

MEMBER(A) 10.6.87

True Copy

29/6/87

SECTION OFFICER

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE