

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCHREVIEW APPLICATION No. 37, 48 to 52/87  
IN APPLICATION NOS. 1327 to 1332/86(T)  
(WP.NO. 7411 to 7416/84 )COMMERCIAL COMPLEX, (BDA)  
INDIRANAGAR,  
BANGALORE-560 038.

DATED: 26-87

APPLICANT

Shri M. Nanjunda Swamy &amp; 5 Ors

## TO

1. Shri M. Nanjunda Swamy  
56, Jayalaxminilaya  
Ramakrishna Layout  
Bangalore - 560 0162. Shri S.L. Ramakrishna  
595, III Cross, V Main  
Hanumanthanagar  
Bangalore - 560 0193. Shri M. Basavaraju  
707, 16th Cross, 25th Main  
J.P. Nagar  
Bangalore - 560 0784. Shri V. Ramachandran  
H-1, Type. III CPWD Quarters  
Vijayanagar  
Bangalore - 560 0405. Shri D.V. Bhuvaramurthy  
21, 4th Block  
Geetha Colony, Jayanagar  
Bangalore - 560 011VsRESPONDENTS

The AG (Accounts), B'lore and 3 Ors

6. Shri K. Krishnappa  
10E/1, 13th Cross, 8th Main Road  
Mall eswaram, Bangalore - 560 003
7. The Accountant General (Accounts)  
Bangalore
8. The Accountant General (Audit)  
Bangalore
9. The Comptroller & Auditor  
General of India  
New Delhi
10. The Secretary  
Ministry of Finance  
Department of Expenditure  
New Delhi
11. Shri M.S. Padmarajaiah  
Senior Central Govt, Stng Counsel  
High Court Buildings  
Bangalore - 560 001

SUBJECT: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE  
BENCH IN APPLICATION NOS 37, 48 to 52/87

REVIEW

....

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

26-5-87

ENCL: As above.

12. Dr. M.S. Nagaraja  
Advocate  
No. 35 ( Above Hotel Swagath )  
1st Main Road, Gauthinagar  
Bangalore - 560009for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
(JUDICIAL)O/c  
Copy to file A.N. 1327 to 32/86  
dated. 26/6/87.

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MAY, 1987.

PRESENT:

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

.. Vice-Chairman.

And:

Hon'ble Mr.P.Srinivasan,

.. Member(A).

REVIEW

/APPLICATIONS NUMBERS 37, 48 TO 52 OF 1987.

1. M.Nanjunda swamy,  
56, Jayalaxminilaya,  
Ramakrishna Lay-out,  
Bangalore-16. .. Applicant in R.A.37/87
2. S.L.Ramakrishna,  
595, III Cross, V Main,  
Hanumanthanagar,Bangalore.
3. M.Basavaraju,  
707, 16th Cross, 25th Main,  
J.P.Nagar, Bangalore-78.
4. V.Ramachandran,  
H-1, Type III CPWD Quarters.,  
Vijayanagar,Bangalore-40.
5. D.V.Bhuvarahamurthy,  
21, 4th Block, Geetha Colony,  
Jayanagar, Bangalore-11.
6. K.Krishnappa,  
10E/1 13th Cross, 8th Main Road,  
Malleswaram, Bangalore.

.. Applicants in A.No.48 to 52/87.

(By Dr.Nagaraj,M.S.,Advocate).

v.

1. The Accountant General,  
(Accounts) Bangalore.
2. The Accountant General,  
(Audit),Bangalore.
3. Comptroller and Auditor  
General of India, New Delhi.
4. The Union of India  
through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Finance,  
Department of Expenditure,  
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

--  
These applications coming for hearing this day, Vice-Chairman  
made the following:

O R D E R

As many as 6 applicants who were the applicants in A.No.1327 to 1332 of 1986 have sought for a review of the order made on 16-12-1986 by this Tribunal. But, still the office had given only one number to all of them, which is not correct. We, therefore, direct the office to treat R.a.No.37 of 1987 as filed by applicant No.1 and assign five more numbers to applicants Nos. 2 to 6.

2. In these review applications made under Section 22(3)(f) of the Act, the applicants have asserted that the order made by this Tribunal rejecting their applications has proceeded on the erroneous assumption that the Special Leave Petition before the Supreme Court directed against the decision of the Allahabad High Court in Miscellaneous Writ Petition No.29/84 had been rejected. The Supreme Court had actually allowed the Special Leave Petition partially without deciding many of the important questions raised in these applications. Therefore, the order dated 16-12-1986 should be reviewed.

3. We have perused the order of the Tribunal and the order of the Supreme Court in the Special Leave Petition referred to in the order of the Tribunal. On such an examination, we find that the assertion of the applicants made in these applications is correct. If that is so, then the order of this Tribunal discloses an error apparent on the face of the record and justifies a review under the Act.

4. In the light of our above discussion, we allow these review applications, recall the order made on 16-12-1986 in Applications Nos.1327 to 1332 of 1986 and direct that they be restored to their original file and be listed for regular hearing before an appropriate Bench.