

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

REVIEW APPLICATION No. 22/87
in Application No. 1584/86(T)
(O.S. NO. 267/85 in C of Munshi f, Belgaum)

COMMERCIAL COMPLEX, (BDA)
INDIRANAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 038.

DATED: 4-5-87

APPLICANT

Vs

RESPONDENTS

Shri G.V. Ranade

The Secy, M/o Communications

TO

1. Shri G.V. Ranade
190/5, Sawarkar Road
Tilakwadi
Belgaum
2. The Secretary
Ministry of Communications
Department of Post Offices
New Delhi
3. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao
Addl Central Govt. Stng Counsel
High Court Buildings
Bangalore - 560 001

SUBJECT: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE
BENCH IN APPLICATION NO. 22/87
- REVIEW

....

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on

27-4-87.

ENCL: As above.

DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF APRIL, 1987.

PRESENT:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy,

Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr. L.H.A. Rego.

MEMBER(A)

REVIEW APPLICATION NUMBER 22 OF 1987.

G.V. Ranade,
Aged about 65 years,
residing at 190/5, Sawarkar Road,
Tilakwadi, Belgaum.

Applicant.

v.

The Union of India
by the Secretary to the
Ministry of Communication, Department of Post Offices
New Delhi.

..Respondent.

(By Sri M. Vasudeva Rao, CGASC)

--

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

ORDER

Case called. Applicant and his learned counsel who have been duly served are absent.

We have perused the application and heard Sri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned Additional Standing Counsel for the respondents. On an examination of the contentions urged, we have held that the period from 7-7-1944 to 30-4-1948 cannot be counted for purpose of pension. When the original application was argued, the applicant did not refer to Rule 26 of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972. When the applicant did not rely on the said rule, he cannot now contend that the order made by us on 29-1-1987 suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record. We have also examined the other grounds which are nothing but a reiteration of the grounds urged before us on the earlier occasion. In dealing

dealing with an application for a review, it is not open to us to take a different view than the one already expressed by us. The earlier order made by us does not call for review. We, therefore, reject this application. No costs.

Ms. D. K. Datta
VICE-CHAIRMAN 27/4/07

[Signature]
MEMBER(A) 25.4.07

np/