

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1987

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 113/1987

Shri Abdul Gafoor,
Sorting Assistant,
Bangalore City RMS,
Bangalore.

.... Applicant

(Shri M.R. Achar, Advocate)

v.

1. K.P. Padmanabhan,
Superintendent (Sorting),
RMS, Bangalore City RMS,
Bangalore.
2. B. Sadashiva Rao,
Senior Superintendent, RMS,
Bangalore Sorting Division,
Bangalore.

.... Respondents.

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

O R D E R

In this application made under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has sought for a review of an order made by a Division Bench of this Tribunal consisting one of us (Shri L.H.A. Rego, Member (A) and Shri Ch. R.K. Rao, Member (J)) dismissing his Application No.1716/86.

2. In making this application, there is a delay of 110 days. In I.A. No.1, the applicant has sought for condoning the said delay.

3. Shri M.R. Achar, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that every one of the facts and circumstances stated in I.A. No.1 constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay and then review the order on the grounds urged in the main application.

4. We are of the view that everyone of the facts and circumstances stated in I.A.No.1 do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay. We, therefore, hold that I.A.No.1 is liable to be rejected. If that is so, then the main review application is also liable to be rejected, without examining the merits. But we do not propose to do so and proceed to examine the merits also.

5. We have perused the order of the Tribunal. We find that every one of the grounds urged by the applicant really asks us to re-examine the order as if we are a court of appeal and come to a different conclusion, which is impermissible in a Review. In this view also, the main review application is liable to be rejected.

6. In the light of our above discussion we, reject the I.A. No.1 and the Review Application at the stage of admission, without notices to respondents.

Ms. P. Macant
Vice-Chairman

2/9/87

Member (A)
Member (A) *2-12-87*

dms/Mrv.

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated : 14-9-87

Review Application No. 113/87 ~~113/87~~

W.P. No. 15 D NO. 1716/86 (F)

Applicant Abdul Gaffoor Vs Supt., RMS, Bangalore and another

To

1. Sri Abdul Gaffoor,
Sooting Assistant,
Bangalore City RMS,
Bangalore.
2. Sri M. R. Achar, Advocate,
No. 1074 & 1075,
Banasankari 1st Stage,
Greenivara Nagar, II Phase,
Bangalore-50

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH IN REVIEW
APPLICATION NO. 113/87

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order/~~Interim Order~~
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on 8.9.87.

Encl : as above.

[Signature]
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER
(JUDICIAL)

Balu*

RECEIVED

Diary No. 113/62/87

Date: 15/9/87

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1987

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 113/1987

Shri Abdul Gafoor,
Sorting Assistant,
Bangalore City RMS,
Bangalore.

.... Applicant

(Shri M.R. Achar, Advocate)

v.

1. K.P. Padmanabhan,
Superintendent (Sorting),
RMS, Bangalore City RMS,
Bangalore.
2. B. Sadashiva Rao,
Senior Superintendent, RMS,
Bangalore Sorting Division,
Bangalore.

.... Respondents.

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

O R D E R

In this application made under Section 22(3)(f) of the
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant has sought
for a review of an order made by a Division Bench of this
Tribunal consisting one of us (Shri L.H.A. Rego, Member (A)
and Shri Ch. R.K. Rao, Member (J)) dismissing his Application
No.1716/86.

2. In making this application, there is a delay of 110
days. In I.A. No.1, the applicant has sought for condoning
the said delay.



3. Shri M.R. Achar, learned counsel for the applicant, contends that every one of the facts and circumstances stated in I.A. No.1 constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay and then review the order on the grounds urged in the main application.

4. We are of the view that everyone of the facts and circumstances stated in I.A.No.1 do not constitute a sufficient ground to condone the delay. We, therefore, hold that I.A.No.1 is liable to be rejected. If that is so, then the main review application is also liable to be rejected, without examining the merits. But we do not propose to do so and proceed to examine the merits also.

5. We have perused the order of the Tribunal. We find that every one of the grounds urged by the applicant really asks us to re-examine the order as if we are a court of appeal and come to a different conclusion, which is impermissible in a Review. In this view also, the main review application is liable to be rejected.

6. In the light of our above discussion we, reject the I.A. No.1 and the Review Application at the stage of admission, without notices to respondents.

Sd---

Vice-Chairman

Sd---

Member (A) 18.6.87

Hare
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE

dms/Mrv.

21/9/87

True copy