

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 109/1987

Shri G.C. Muniramaiah,  
Scientist-B,  
LRDE, DRDO Complex,  
Sir C.V. Ramannagar,  
Bangalore.

..... Applicant.

(Shri M. Narayanaswamy, Advocate)

v.

1. The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi.
2. The Scientific Adviser,  
Ministry of Defence &  
Director General,  
Research & Development  
Organisation,  
New Delhi.
3. The Director,  
LRDE,  
DRDO Complex,  
Sir C.V. Raman Nagar,  
Bangalore.

This application having come up for hearing to-day,  
Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

In this application made under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('the Act') the applicant has sought for a review of an order made by a Division Bench of this Tribunal on 20.7.1987 rejecting his Application No.572/87 at the admission stage without notice to the respondents.

2. In his application, the applicant sought for enforcement of a civil court decree obtained by him without impleading the respondents to the said decree. On an examination of the same, this Tribunal held that that decree, to which the respondents were not parties, was not binding on them on which view it rejected the application summarily.

3. Shri M.Narayanaswamy, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that his client was only seeking for the enforcement of the corrected date of birth in the SSLC Marks Card and was not seeking to enforce the decree as such and by its failure to appreciate the same had committed a patent error apparent on the face of the record.

4. We are of the view that the contention of Shri Narayanaswamy even if correct, does not constitute an apparent error to justify a review by us. In reality and in substance, the applicant is asking us to re-examine the earlier order, as if we are a court of appeal and come to a different conclusion which is impermissible in a review.

5. On the foregoing discussion, we hold that this Review Application is liable to be rejected. We, therefore, reject the review application at the admission stage, without notice to the respondents.

*Ms. Prakasham*  
Vice-Chairman  
25/8/87

*P. S. U.*  
25/8/87  
Member (A)

REGISTERED

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

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

Dated : 11/9/87

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 109  
IN APPLICATION NO. 572/87(F)

W.P. NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant

Shri G.C. Muniramaiah

v/s The Secretary, M/o Defence & 2 Ors

To

1. Shri G.C. Muniramaiah  
Scientist 'B'  
LRDE, DRDO Complex  
Sir C.V. Ramannagar  
Bangalore - 560 093
2. Shri M. Narayanaswamy  
Advocate  
844 (Upstairs)  
Vth Block, Rajajinagar  
Bangalore - 560 010

Received two copies.

*Enc. Muniramaiah*  
2/9/87

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/STAY/

~~XXXXXX ORDER XXXX~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said Review  
application on 25-8-87.

Encl : as above

*Mr. Venkatesh*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
~~SECTION OFFICER~~  
(JUDICIAL)

*jc*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 109/1987

Shri G.C. Muniramaiah,  
Scientist-B,  
LRDE, DRDO Complex,  
Sir C.V. Ramannagar,  
Bangalore.

.... Applicant.

(Shri M. Narayanaswamy, Advocate)

v.

1. The Secretary,  
Ministry of Defence,  
New Delhi.
2. The Scientific Adviser,  
Ministry of Defence &  
Director General,  
Research & Development  
Organisation,  
New Delhi.
3. The Director,  
LRDE,  
DRDO Complex,  
Sir C.V. Raman Nagar,  
Bangalore.

.... Respondents.

This application having come up for hearing to-day,  
Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

In this application made under Section 22(3)(f) of  
the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1935 ('the Act') the  
applicant has sought for a review of an order made by  
a Division Bench of this Tribunal on 20.7.1987 rejecting  
his Application No.572/87 at the admission stage without  
notice to the respondents.



2. In his application, the applicant sought for enforcement of a civil court decree obtained by him without impleading the respondents to the said decree. On an examination of the same, this Tribunal held that that decree, to which the respondents were not parties, was not binding on them on which view it rejected the application summarily.

3. Shri M.Narayanaswamy, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that his client was only seeking for the enforcement of the corrected date of birth in the SSLC Marks Card and was not seeking to enforce the decree as such and by its failure to appreciate the same had committed a patent error apparent on the face of the record.

4. We are of the view that the contention of Shri Narayanaswamy even if correct, does not constitute an apparent error to justify a review by us. In reality and in substance, the applicant is asking us to re-examine the earlier order, as if we are a court of appeal and come to a different conclusion which is impermissible in a review.

5. On the foregoing discussion, we hold that this Review Application is liable to be rejected. We, therefore, reject the review application at the admission stage, without notice to the respondents.

→ Re. Venkatesh Sd/-  
REPUTY REGISTRAR  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
APPELLATE BENCH  
BANGALORE

25/8/81

dms/Mrv.

Sd/-  
Member (A)

- True copy -