

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex (BDA)
Indiranagar
Bangalore - 560 038

Dated : 14 JUN 1988

REVIEW APPLICATION NOS. 52 to 54 / 88
IN APPLICATION NOS. 1009, 1027 & 1028/87(F) / 88
W.P. NO.

Applicant(s)

Shri V. Moorthy
To

Respondent(s)

V/s The Director, Meterological Centre, HAL & 3 Ore

1. Shri V. Moorthy
F.B. 52, HAL Quarters
Vimanapura P.O.
Bangalore - 560 017
2. Dr M.S. Nagaraja
Advocate
35 (Above Hotel Swagath)
1st Main, Gandhinagar
Bangalore - 560 009

Subject : SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/~~STAY~~/~~INTERIM ORDER~~
Review application(s) on 9-6-88
passed by this Tribunal in the above said

g. K. N. Nagaraja
12-6-88
Encl : As above

g.c.
R. Venkatesh
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE NINETH DAY OF JUNE, 1988

Present: Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy .. Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri L.H.A. Rego .. Member (A)

REVIEW APPLICATION NOS. 52 TO 54/1988

Shri V. Murthy
Ex-Scientific Assistant
Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd.
Vimanapura
Bangalore-17.

.. Applicant

(Dr. M.S. Nagaraja, Advocate)

Vs.

1. The Director
Meteorological Centre
Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd.,
Bangalore - 17.
2. The Regional Director
Regional Meteorological Centre
College Road,
Madras-6.
3. The Pay and Accounts Officer
Indian Meteorological Department
College Road
Madras-6.
4. The Director General
Meteorological Department
Mausam Bhavan
Lodi Road
New Delhi. 110 003.

.. Respondents

These applications having come up
for hearing before this Tribunal today, Hon'ble Vice
Chairman, made the following:

ORDER

We have heard Dr. M.S. Nagaraja,
learned counsel for the applicant.

2. In these applications made under
Section 22(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, ('Act'),

.....2/-



1985, the applicant has sought for a review of our order made on 23.3.1988 in A. Nos. 1009, 1027 and 1028 of 1987.

3. In his original applications, the applicant while seeking for diverse reliefs had claimed interest on the delayed payments. On 23.3.1988 we accepted the substantial claims of the applicant however disallowing his claim for interest. Aggrieved by the disallowance of interest claim only, the applicant had sought for a review of our order to that extent only.

4. In paragraphs 12 to 14 of our order, we have dealt with the claim of the applicant for interest and we have negatived the same for the reasons stated in our order. Even assuming that every one of the reasons stated by us are not sound or correct then also, the same will not constitute an error apparent on the face of the record to justify a review under Section 22(3) (f) of the Act read with O.47 R.1 of the C.P.C.

5. On ^{the above} ~~the~~ view, these applications for review are liable to be rejected. We, therefore, reject these applications at the admission stage, without notices to the respondents.



Sd/-

VICE CHAIRMAN

Sd/-

MEMBER (A)

9.6.1988

TRUE COPY

mr.

RAJ. Srinivasiah
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JDL)
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE
13/6