

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560 038.

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.6/93 in

Dated: **17 JUN 1993**

APPLICATION NO(s).

172 of 1992.

Applicant(s) H.Morris Williams

v/s Respondent(s) Ministry of Defence.

- To
1. Sri.H.Morris Williams,
S/o.LatBY L.Marris,
Lower Division Clerk,
Office of the Commander
Works Engineer (Air Force),
Bellary Road,J.C.Nagar Post,
Bangalore-560006.
 2. Sri.M.S.Anandaramu,
Advocate,No.27,
1st Main Road,
1st Floor,
Chandrasekhar Complex,
Gandhinagar,
Bangalore-9.
 3. Secretary,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.
 4. Engineer in Chief,
Sena Mukyalaya Pramukh Enginner,
Army Headquarters,
DHQ Post, New Delhi.
 5. Chief Enggineer,
Southern Command,Pune-411001.
 6. Chief Engineer (Air Force),
No.2,D.C.Area (Dies Road),
Yeshwanthpur post,
Bangalore-22.
 7. Sri.M.Vasudeva Rao,
Central Govt.Stng.Counsel,
High Court Building,
Bangalore-1.

SUBJECT:- Forwarding of copies of the Order passed by
the Central Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore Bench
Bangalore.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/
STAY/INTERIM ORDER passed by this Tribunal in the above said
application(s) on 08-06-93.

Copies issued
Im

Re for

[Signature]
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH : BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE, 1993

PRESENT

HON'BLE SHRI S. GURUSANKARAN ... MEMBER (A)
HON'BLE SHRI A.N. VUJJANARADHYA ... MEMBER (J)

REVIEW APPLICATION No.6/93

H. Morris Williams,
S/o. Late L. Harris,
Lower Division Clerk,
Office of the Commander
Works Engineer (Air Force),
Bellary Road, J.C. Nagar,
Post, Bangalore - 560 006. ... Applicant

(Shri K. Subba Rao ... Advocate)

Vs.

1. The Union of India
Rep. by its Secretary,
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
 2. The Sena Mukyalaya Pramukh
Engineer, Army Headquarters,
By Engineer in Chief,
DHQ Post, New Delhi.
 3. Chief Engineer, Southern
Command, Pune - 411 001.
 4. The Chief Engineer (Air Force),
No.2, D.C. Area (Dies Road),
Yeswanthapur Post, Bangalore-22. ... Respondents
- (Shri M. Vasudeva Rao ... Advocate)

This Review Application, having come up before this
Tribunal today for admission, Hon'ble Shri S. Gurusankaran,
Member (A) made the following.

ORDER

This Review Application has been filed by the Review
Applicant, who was the applicant in O.A. No.172/92. O.A. 172/92
came to be disposed off by a bench of this Tribunal vide order
dated 18.12.1992. In the order the application was rejected at
the admission stage itself holding that it is barred by principles
of resjudicata.



2. On filing of this Review Application, notice was issued to the respondents herein who were also the respondents in O.A.172/92. They have put in their appearance and filed their reply submitting that there is no merit in the review application.

3. We have heard Shri Ananda Ramu on the question of admission of this review application. It is specifically seen ^{that} in para 6 on page 4, the review applicant has stated that "the relief/s sought for by the applicant has not been properly adjudicated and the decision rendered by this Hon'ble Tribunal is totally erraneous." The scope of review application is very limited and a review application is not a proper forum for seeking relief against the erraneous judgement. Apart from ^{the} submission the review applicant has not brought forth any other error apparent on the face of record and has not made any sufficient grounds for reviewing the order dated 18.12.1992.

4. In view of the above, the review application is rejected at the admission stage itself ⁱⁿ

sd-

sd-



MEMBER (J)

MEMBER (A)

TRUE COPY

[Signature]
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE

17/6/93