

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

REVIEW APPLICATION No. 45/87
IN APPLICATION NO. 1372/86(T)
(WP.NO. 5564/84)

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

DATED: 3-6-87

APPLICANT

Vs

RESPONDENTS

Shri J. Ramanathan

The Secy, M/o Finance and 2 Ors

TO

1. Shri J. Ramanathan
No. 54, Domlur Layout
Bangalore - 560 071
2. Shri G.A. Anthony Cruze
Advocate
No. 24, L.M. Street
(Beside) Commercial Street
Bangalore - 560 001

SUBJECT: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE
BENCH IN APPLICATION NO. 45/87
REVIEW

....

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of the Order
passed by this Tribunal in the above said Application on
27-5-87.

ENCL: As above.

R. S. Sanyal
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

o/c

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH, BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF MAY 1987

Present : Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S.Puttaswamy ... Vice-Chairman

Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan ... Member (A)

REVIEW APPLICATION No.45/87

J.Ramanathan,
No.54, Domlur Layout,
Bangalore-560 071.

... Applicant

V.

The Union of India
by its Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
New Delhi.

The Financial Adviser,
Defence Services,
Finance Division,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.

The Controller General of Defence Accounts,
R.K. Puram, New Delhi.

... Respondents.

This Review application came up for admission before this
Tribunal today. Hon'ble Vice Chairman made the following:

O R D E R

Case called. Shri J. Ramanathan applicant in the case submits
that he may be heard in support of his application and the case decided.
We have heard the applicant.

2. In this application made under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative
Tribunals Act, 1985, the applicant who was also the applicant in the
original application, has sought for a review of our order made on
1.4.1987 dismissing his application No.1372/86.

3. In his original application which was a transferred application
from the High Court of Karnataka the applicant has challenged his
non selection from the cadre of Accounts Officer to the Indian Defence
Accounts Services Group A in the years 1978 and 1980. On 1.4.1987,
the applicant and his learned counsel were absent. But notwithstanding
the same we examined the papers including the original papers relating

to the non selection of the applicant on the two occasions and found that his challenge against his nonselection in 1978 and 1980 was not merited. On that view we dismissed the application by a considered order.

M ^{this Review B}
4. In ~~the original~~ application the applicant is virtually asking us to reexamine our order as if we are a court of appeal against our own order. We are of the view that every one of the grounds urged in the application and reiterated before us with considerable zeal and emphasis do not disclose an error apparent on the face of the record or disclose any other ground that justifiably falls within the perview of order 47 of Rule 1 of CPC. In an application for review it is not open to this Tribunal to reexamine its own order and come to a different conclusion. In this view this application is liable to be rejected at the admission stage.

5. We, therefore, reject this application at the admission stage without reference to the Respondents.

bsv

Ms. Prakash
VICE CHAIRMAN 27/5/87

P. S.
MEMBER (A) 27/5/87