

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 5th DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

Present : Hon'ble Justice Sri K.S.Puttaswamy. Vice-Chairman  
Hon'ble Sri L.H.A.Rege Member (A)

REVIEW APPLICATION No. 98/87 in Application No. 1836/1986

M.N.Mangunatha,  
Door No.1/2,  
Behind Sandalwood Oil Factory,  
Jayanagar,  
Mysore

...

Applicant

( Sri K.N.Chandrasekhar

... Advocate )

Vs.

The Union of India,  
by its Secretary to Govt. of India,  
M/o Railways,  
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.

The Southern Railway,  
represented by the Genral Manager,  
Central Southern Area,  
Madras - 1.

The Selection Committee for the  
Recruitment of Temporary Khalasis  
Mechanical Workshop, by its  
Chairman, Sri R.Vijaya Mahan,  
Works Manager, Mechanical Workshop,  
Southern Railway, Mysore South,  
Mysore - 8, and 60 others. ...

Respondents

This Review application has come up before the court today. Hon'ble Justice Sri K.S.Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman made the following :

ORDER

In filing the review application, there is a delay of 31 days. In I.A.No.I, the applicant has sought for condoning the said delay. I.A.No.I is supported by an affidavit sworn to by Sri K.V.Chandrasekhar, learned Advocate for the applicant.

We have no reasons to doubt the correctness of the assertions made by the deponent in his affidavit, which necessarily means that there is sufficient cause for condoning the delay. We therefore allow I.A.No.I and condone the delay.

2. After condoning the delay, we have heard Sri K.N. Chandrasekhar, learned counsel for the applicant on the admission of application for review. While noticing the absence of the applicant and his learned counsel, we have rejected Application No.1836 of 1986 following an earlier decision of this Tribunal. We have again examined whether we have correctly applied the principle enunciated in Applications Nos. 1845 to 1866 of 1986, 183 and 184 of 1987. We are satisfied that the principle enunciated in A.Nos.1845 to 1866 of 1986, 183 and 184 of 1987 has been correctly applied. If that is so, then the presence of the learned counsel for the applicant on the hearing date would not have made any difference at all. We thus find no justification to review our earlier order. We, therefore, reject the review application at the admission stage.

*As. J. M. Srinivasan*  
VICE-CHAIRMAN *5/8/87*

*As. J. M. Srinivasan*  
MEMBER (A) *5-2-87*

an.

REGISTERED

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

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

Dated : 17-6-87

REVIEW APPLICATION NO 98 /87( )  
IN APPLICATION NO. 1836/86(T)

W.P. NO \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant

Shri M.N. Manjunatha

V/s The Secy, M/o Railways & 2 Ors

To

1. Shri M.N. Manjunatha  
Door No. 1/2  
Behind Sandalwood Oil Factory  
Jayanagar  
Mysore
2. Shri K.N. Chandrasekhar  
Advocate  
612, Chandra Buildings  
Avenue Road  
Bangalore - 560 002

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/XXXX/

XXXXXXXXXXXXX passed by this Tribunal in the above said Review  
application on 5-8-87.

Encl : as above

*B. N. Venkatesh Reddy*  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
XXXXXXXXXXXXX  
(JUDICIAL)

18/8/87

jc.

Diary No. 1001/GIR/87.  
Impd D. No. 21-8-87  
Impd  
21/8/87

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 5th DAY OF AUGUST, 1987

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

Hon'ble Sri L.R.A. Rega Member (A)

REVIEW APPLICATION No. 98/87 in Application No. 1335/1985

M.N. Manjunatha,  
Door No. 1/2,  
Behind Sandalwood Oil Factory,  
Jayanagar,  
Mysore

...

Applicant

( Sri K.V. Chandrasekhar ... Advocate )

Is.

The Union of India,  
by its Secretary to Govt. of India,  
M/o Railways,  
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.

The Southern Railway,  
represented by the General Manager,  
Central Southern Area,  
Madras - 1.

The Selection Committee for the  
Recruitment of Temporary Khelasis  
Mechanical Workshop, by its  
Chairman, Sri R. Vijaya Mahan,  
Works Manager, Mechanical Workshop,  
Southern Railway, Mysore South,  
Mysore - 8, and 60 others.

...

Respondents

This Review application has come up before the court today. Hon'ble Justice Sri K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman made the following :

ORDER

In filing the review application, there is a delay of 31 days. In I.A.No. I, the applicant has sought for condoning the said delay. I.A.No. I is supported by an affidavit sworn to by Sri K.V. Chandrasekhar, learned Advocate for the applicant.



RECEIVED  
 17/12/87  
 B.V. Vimala  
 SECRETARY

- True copy -

VICE-CHAIRMAN 5/8/87  
 MEMBER (A) 1/5/87

84

84



the presence of the learned counsel for the applicant in the hearing date would not have made any difference at all. We thus find no justification for review and earlier order. We, therefore, reject the review application at the admission stage.

183 and 184 of 1937 has been correctly applied. If that is so, then that the principle is enunciated in A.M. 1845 to 1855 of 1935, Nos. 1845 to 1855 of 1935, 183 and 184 of 1937. We are satisfied have correctly applied the principle enunciated in Applications decision of this Tribunal. We have again examined whether we rejected application No. 1835 of 1935 following an earlier absence of the applicant and his learned counsel, we have admission of application for review. While setting the Chandrasekhari, learned counsel for the applicant on the 2. After considering the delay, we have heard Sri P.M. as therefore allow P.M. I and condone the delay. means that there is sufficient cause for condoning the delay. made by the defendant in his affidavit, which necessarily we have no reason to doubt the correctness of the evidence