

28

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH. BOMBAY.

RA No.29/93 in
Regn.No.OA 518/91

Date of decision: 23/1/93

A.N.Dias & 22 ors. ... Petitioners
vs.

Union of India & ors. ... Respondents

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.K. DHAON. VICE CHAIRMAN (J)
THE HON'BLE MS.USHA SAVARA.MEMBER(A)

ORDER

(Passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.K.
Dhaon. Vice Chairman(J) in circulation)

4) a common
By/ order dated 29.1.93, we had finally
disposed of 32 Original Applications.

2. By order dated 18.2.93, we disposed of
OA No.84/92. We followed the order passed by
us in the bunch of 32 Original Applications
while disposing of OA No.84/92 as we felt that
the controversy raised in OA 84/92 was similar
to that which was involved in the said bunch
of 32 OAs. By means of Review Application No.29/93,
the orders passed by us on 29.1.93 and 18.2.93
are sought to be reviewed.

3. We have perused the contents of the
Review Application. We are satisfied that our
orders do not suffer from any error apparent
on the face of the record. Our jurisdiction
to review our orders is circumscribed ^{by} the
provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In our opinion,
none of the clauses of the said provisions
is attracted. The thrust of the averments
made in the Review Application, in substance,

(29)

is that our orders are wrong. By that as it
may, an erroneous order can be ~~submitted~~^{subjected} to
an appeal and not to a review ~~application~~

4. We are disposing of this Review Application
by adopting the process of circulation which
is permissible under the rules.

5. The Review Application is rejected.

U. Savara
(USHA SAVARA)
MEMBER(A)

S.K.D
(S.K.DHAON)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

SNS

SLP filed against this order
under no 19494 to 19518/94

were Dismissed on

28-10-94

R