

# IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW BOMBAY BENCH

O.A. No. 869/92  
T.A. No.

198

DATE OF DECISION 15.9.1992

Shri M.K.Godbole Petitioner

Applicant in person Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India & ors. Respondent

None Advocate for the Respondent(s)

## CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. M.Y.PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A)

The Hon'ble Mr.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

  
(M.Y.PRIOLKAR)  
M/A

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BOMBAY BENCH  
CAMPAI NAGPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO: 869/92

Shri M.K.Godbole,  
B-1/11, Vijayanand Society,  
Wardha road, Dhantoli.  
Nagpur.- 440012

.... Applicant

V/s

Union of India

and another

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI M.Y.PRIOLKAR, MEMBER (A)

Appearance :

Applicant in person

ORAL JUDGEMENT

15.9.1992

(PER : M.Y.PRIOLKAR, Member (A))

The grievance of the applicant is <sup>basically</sup> that the deputation allowance which he was paid while on deputation to Indian Railway construction Company has not been taken into account for fixation of his retirement benefits. For the same grievance, the applicant had earlier filed an application before this Tribunal Viz.O.A.43/88 and the same was dismissed on merits on 18.4.1990. A review application against that decision had been filed by the applicant which was also rejected on 28.8.1990. Further miscellaneous petition submitted by the applicant for the same grievance was also not entertained <sup>no</sup> stating that second review lies against the decision of the Tribunal.

3

2. The applicant who argued in person stated that this second application for the same grievance deserves to be entertained by the Tribunal on principles of natural justice. This Tribunal cannot, however, sit in appeal over its <sup>earlier</sup> judgements, which is the province of a Court of Appeal. The grievance of the applicant now is that our earlier judgement in O.A.43/88 as well as the decision on the review petition dated 18.4.1990 are erroneous on merits. The applicant should have approached the proper forum for redressal of this grievance. This O.A. is accordingly dismissed as not maintainable with no orders as to costs.

  
(M.Y. PRIOLKAR)  
M/A

srl