

REGISTERED

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

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

Dated : 18-9-87

REVIEW APPLICATION NO 78 / 87 ()

W.P. NO

Applicant

Shri F.A. Nadaf

V/s

The Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs,
Belgaum & 2 Ors

To

1. Shri F. A. Nadaf
Telephone Operator
Gokak - 591 307
Belgaum District
2. Shri S. Ranganatha Jois
Advocate
36, Vagdevi
Shankarapuram
Bangalore - 560 004

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~STAY~~/
~~INTERIM ORDER~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said Review
application on 4-9-87.

Encl : as above

[Signature]
Deputy Registrar
~~SECTION OFFICER~~
(JUDICIAL)

RECEIVED

Diary No. 1160 / CR/87

Date: 18/9/87

yc

3. But Shri S.Ranganatha Jois, learned counsel for the applicant, orally moved us to condone the delay and deal with the application on merits.

4. An oral application for condonation of delay cannot be properly entertained and granted. On this short ground the application is liable to be rejected without examining the merits. But, we do not propose to do so, and proceed to examine whether this is a fit case for review of our order.

5. On a detailed examination of every one of the contentions urged, this Tribunal had disposed of the application in the manner it had done.

6. Shri Jois contends (i) that this Tribunal was not justified in denying back wages from 1-3-1984 to 30-4-1987; (ii) that this Tribunal was not justified in reserving liberty to hold a fresh inquiry; (iii) that the Tribunal was not justified in reserving liberty to place the applicant under suspension, and (iv) that the Tribunal was not justified in disallowing the costs of the application.

7. We are of the view that Shri Jois really asks us to examine our earlier order as if we are a Court of appeal and come to a different conclusion which is impermissible in a review. We are of the view that every one of the grounds urged by Sri Jois do not justify us to review our earlier order.



9

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1987

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 78/1987

Shri F.A. Nadaf,
Major, Telephone Operator,
Gokak, District: Belgaum.

.... Applicant

(Shri S. Ranganatha Jois, Advocate)

v.

1. The Divisional Engineer,
Telegraphs, Belgaum.

2. The Director of Tele-Communi-
cations, Hubli.

3. The Assistant Engineer,
Trunks, Belgaum.

.... 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 this Tribunal
on 8/9.4.1987 partially allowing his application No.1367/86.

2. The order of the Tribunal was made on 8/9.4.1987.
But the review application is presented before us on
8.6.1987 and thus there is a delay of 31 days in making
the application. The applicant has not made any application
for condonation of delay.

8. In the light of our above discussion, we hold that this application is liable to be rejected. We, therefore, reject this application at the admission stage, without notices to the respondents.

Sd/-
Vice-Chairman 4/2010

Sd/-
Member (A)

- True copy -

dms/Mrv.

R. V. Unnikrishnan
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE
18/9/10