

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,
Commercial Complex,
Indiranagar,
Bangalore-560038.

Review Application No 13/93 in

APPLICATION NO(S) 160 of 1992

APPLICANTS: A. G. Meundi

RESPONDENTS: General Manager,
South Central Rly, Secunderabad & M.S.

TO,

① Sri. Umesh R. Mahimalki,
Advocate, No-4, 2nd Cross,
Vasanthnagar West,
Bangalore-560052

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

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/~~STAY/INTERIM ORDER~~, passed by this Tribunal in the above said application(s) on 26th August 93.

Issued
to

for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

159693

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH: :BANGALORE

DATED THIS TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1993

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

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.13/93

Shri A.G.Meundi,
Son of Gurupadappa Meundi,
42 years, occ: Accounts Clerk
Office of the workshop Accounts Officer,
South Central Railway,
Hubli. Applicant
(Shri Umesh R.Malimath - Advocate)

Versus

1. The General Manager,
South Central Railway,
Secunderabad,
Andhra Pradesh.
2. Divisional Accounts Officer,
South Central Railway,
Hubli. Respondents

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

O R D E R

This Review Application has been filed by
the applicant, who was also the applicant in CA 160/92,
which came to be disposed of by a Bench of this Tribunal
by order dated 5.11.92 against the order passed on 11.3.1992
regarding withdrawal of relief for considering his case for
promotion from 1984 when the case of his immediate junior
was considered for promotion.



2. The Review Applicant has stated in MP No.95/93

that he could not file his Review Application earlier since he was not aware of the order dated 11.3.1992 and a copy of the same was supplied to him only on 8.12.1992, when he came to Bangalore to enquire about his case. Even granting ~~that~~ ^{that} a copy of this order was not sent to the applicant as required under the C.A.T. procedure rules, it is evident that this order dated 11.3.1992 was made at the stage of preliminary hearing when the case came up for admission. At that time it was pointed out to the learned counsel for the applicant that the office had raised an objection about the delay relating to his relief for promotion from 1984 and on being questioned, the learned counsel in that application did not press for the main relief and submitted that he would confine himself for the alternative relief. Thus, the counsel, who holds vakalatnama on behalf of the applicant, was aware of the order passed on 11.3.1992 regarding the cancellation of the main relief sought for in the application and confined ^{himself} to the alternative relief. In view of this, we do not find sufficient ground made out for condonation of delay in admitting this Review Application and on this ground alone the Review Application deserves dismissal.

3. However, even otherwise, we are unable to find any merit in the submission of the learned counsel for the Review Applicant regarding the grounds for reviewing the order dated 11.3.1992. He submits that even from the reply of the respondents filed in the DA, the application was not hit by the bar of limitation and in any case the applicant was not aware of the main relief not being pressed. The grounds for reviewing the application ~~on which the order~~ ^{it} ~~can be reviewed~~ are very limited and the grounds put-forth by the learned counsel do not come within the narrow campus.

As such we do not find any ground for reviewing the order

dated 11.3.1992.

4. Accordingly this Review Application is rejected at the admission stage itself.

n.p./

Sd-

(A.N.VUJJANARADHYA)
MEMBER (J)

Sd-

(S.GURUSANKARAN)
MEMBER (A)



TRUE COPY

A. [Signature]

15/9/93

SECTION OFFICER
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
ADDITIONAL BENCH
BANGALORE