

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
BOMBAY BENCH, 'GULESTAN' BUILDING NO.6,  
PRESCOT ROAD, BOMBAY - 1.

(25)

1. Review Petition No.64/95  
in  
Original Application No.46/92 and
2. Review Petition No.65/95  
Original Application No,221/92  
-----

Monday, this the Fifteenth day of January, 1996.

Hon'ble Shri B.S.Hegde, Member(J)  
Hon'ble Shri M.R.Kolhatkar, Member(A).

Lahu Savalaram Mhatre.  
(By Advocate Shri D.V.Gangal)

... Applicant.

V/s.

Union of India & Another.  
(By Advocate Shri V.S. Masurkar).

... Respondents.

ORAL ORDER

(Per Shri M.R.Kolhatkar, Member(A))

In these Review Petitions which are in the nature of speaking to the minutes, the Review Petitioner (original applicant) has prayed that correction in para 15 should be effected so far as the dates to read as March, 1990 to 1991 instead of March, 1989 to March, 1990 so far as withholding of increment for one year is concerned and the order part also may be corrected to read as March, 1991 instead of March, 1990 being the date of expiry of penalty.

2. The matter came up on 18.12.1995 and the learned counsel for the respondents stated that he wish<sup>ed</sup> to file a reply. Accordingly, the matter stood adjourned to 15.1.1996. In the reply the stand taken is that the Review Petition may be dismissed since it is not filed within 30 days. We are not inclined to accept this contention especially because in para 6 of the reply the respondents have stated that so far as the date of awarding sentence is


24

concerned the clerical error can be corrected by the Tribunal. Accordingly, we hereby direct as below.

In para 15 of the Judgment in O.A. Nos. 46/92 and 221/92 at line 16 from the top should read as "his penalty from March, 1990 upto March, 1991" instead of what appears. It is further directed that in the operative portion of the order line 9 from the top should read as "of expiry of penalty in March, 1991" instead of what appears.

3. It is further directed that the order should be deemed to have been corrected ab initio viz. from the date of delivery. Since we had given the liberty to the applicant to make a representation to the department, this liberty would, however, count from the date of communication of the corrected order. There would be no order as to costs.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(M.R. KOLHATKAR)  
MEMBER (A)

  
(B.S. HEGDE)  
MEMBER (J).

B.