

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

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

Dated: 21 JUL 1993

Review APPLICATION NO(s). 7/93 in OA no 687/91

Applicant(s)

Dr. Suresh C. Singhal

Respondent(s)

Control General, ~~of~~ Indian Bureau of
Mines & 2 yrs.

1. Dr. Suresh C. Singhal,
Rima Niwas,
7, Chhatrapati Nagar,
Byramji Town,
Nagpur - 440 013.

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 14.07.93

M. D. S. 21/7/93
for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: :BANGALORE

DATED THIS FOURTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1993

Present: Hon'ble Shri S.Gurusankaran, Member (A)
Hon'ble Shri A.N.Vujjanaradhy, Member (J)

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.7/93.

IN
APPLICATION NO.687/1991.

Dr. Suresh C.Singhal
'Uma Niwas'
7 Chitnavis Nagar,
Byramji Town,
Nagpur-440 013.
(Applicant in person) .. Applicant

Versus

1. The Controller General,
Indian Bureau of Mines,
Nagpur.
2. The Pay and Accounts Officer,
Indian Bureau of Mines,
Nagpur.
3. The Union of India,
represented by the
Secretary to the Government of India,
Department of Mines,
Ministry of Steel and Mines,
New Delhi.

.. Respondents.

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

O R D E R

This Review Application has been filed by the applicant in OA 687/91, which came to be disposed of by a bench of this Tribunal, in which one of us was a party



(Hon'ble Shri S.Gurusankaran, Member (A)) vide order dated 11.12.1992. In this Review Application the applicant has stated that there was a mistake apparent on the face of the record in that his prayer in the OA for granting of commutation of pension from 1.9.1989 ie. the day after his retirement, has not been allowed and hence he prays for review of the judgment as far as denying commutation of pension from 1.9.1989 is concerned.

2. We have heard the applicant. He strongly argues that since it has already been held that the minor penalty proceedings continued after his retirement was illegal and he became entitled for all retirement benefits with effect from 1.9.1989 ~~and hence~~ he should have been granted commutation of pension also from 1.9.1989. He further submits that he has the right, provided under the rules and his rights cannot be taken away. We are not impressed by the argument of the applicant. We do not find any error apparent on the face of the record. In fact in this Review Application ~~his~~ ^{the attempt} prayer is to re-argue the case, since we find that detailed arguments were submitted by the learned counsel appeared on behalf of the applicant in OA No.687/91 regarding his claim for re-assessment for commutation of pension and the same has been discussed in para 9 of the judgment and the claim has been rejected. The scope of the Review Application is very limited and an alleged erroneous judgment cannot be corrected through a Review Application.

3. In view of the above, we find no merit in this Review Application and the R.A. is dismissed at the admission stage itself.



Sd-
MEMBER (J)

Sd-
MEMBER (A)

TRUE COPY

R. Alen S
SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE

21/3/93