

9

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

Review Petition No.24/93
in
O.A. 801/91

Smt. Parvatibai

.. Review Petitioner

-versus-

Engineer in Chief,
Army Head Quarters,
Engineer's Branch,
New Delhi and 2 ors.

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Shri M.Y. Priolkar, Member(A)

Hon'ble Shri V.D. Deshmukh, Member(J)


TRIBUNAL'S ORDER ON REVIEW PETITION
BY CIRCULATION

Date: 30.4.93


4. This review application has been filed by the applicant in O.A.801/91 against our judgment dated 22-1-1993 in that O.A. The review of the judgment is sought on the ground that the Tribunal has erred in not condoning the delay in filing the original application and also the statement made in the judgment that four elder sons of the applicant are already in service is not true.

2. We had dismissed the O.A. by our judgment dated 22-1-1993 not only because of limitation but also on merits. No doubt there is probably an error in the judgment as pointed out in the review petition inasmuch as it is mentioned that four elder sons of the applicant are already in service. But this could not have made any difference to the conclusion arrived at in the judgment. The reason given in the judgment why we thought this to be not a fit case for interference by us is that the widow had received terminal benefits of Rs.50,000/- and was

also in receipt of family pension of Rs.400/- per month and merely because there is one able bodied son of 30 years of age still unemployed, the family ~~cannot~~^{can} could not be considered to be in indigent circumstances requiring immediate assistance. The fact that there are only two elder sons in service instead of four as mentioned in the judgment will not, in our view, alter this position. We do not, therefore, find any sufficient reason warranting a review of our judgment dated 22-1-1993. The review petition is rejected.


(V.D.DESHMUKH)
Member(J)

M


(M.Y.PRIOLKAR)
Member(A)