

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
BANGALORE BENCH

Second Floor,  
Commercial Complex,  
Indiranagar,  
Bangalore-38.

Review Application No.31 of 1993 in

Dated: 18 NOV 1993

APPLICATION NO(s) 590 of 1991.

APPLICANTS: C. Somasekhar v/s. RESPONDENTS: Secretary, Ministry of  
Railways, New Delhi and Others.

TO.

1. Sri. M. S. Anandaramu,  
Advocate, No. 27,  
Chandrashekar Complex,  
First Floor, First Main,  
Gandhinagar, Bangalore-9.
2. General Manager,  
Southern Railway,  
Park Town, Madras-600003.
3. Sri. N. S. Prasad, Advocate,  
No. 242, Fifth Main Road,  
Gandhinagar, Bangalore-9.

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

-xxx-

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the  
ORDER/STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/, Passed by this Tribunal  
in the above mentioned application(s) on 10th Nov'1993.

for DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

18/11/93

gm\*

REVIEW APPLICATION NUMBER 31 OF 1993

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1993

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, .. Vice-Chairman.

And

Mr. V. Ramakrishnan, .. Member(A).

C. Somasekhar,  
S/o B. Chandrasekhar,  
working as Traction Foreman,  
Southern Railway, r/o  
No. 351, 18th Main, 11th Cross,  
J.P. Nagar, II Phase, Bangalore-78. .. Applicant.

(By Advocate Shri M.S. Anandaramu)

v.

1. The Union of India,  
represented by its Secretary,  
Ministry of Railways,  
Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager,  
Southern Railway, Park Town,  
Madras.
3. The Deputy Chief Electrical Engineer,  
Railway Electrification,  
Bangalore. .. Respondents.

(By Standing Counsel Shri N.S. Prasad)

ORDER

Mr. Justice P.K. Shyamsundar, Vice-Chairman:

We have heard Mr. M.S. Anandaramu, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri N.S. Prasad, learned Standing Counsel for respondents. We do not see any reasons why our order in O.A. 590 of 1991 should be reviewed as whatever complaint made in the original application was considered and found unfit for acceptance and discarded. In that situation if the applicant still feels that we are wrong he should prefer an appeal and not a review petition. There is neither any error apparent on the face of the record nor any new facts are brought to the forray seeking reconsideration by means of a review application. This application therefore, rejected. No costs.



TRUE COPY

SECTION OFFICER  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
ADDITIONAL BENCH  
BANGALORE

MEMBER(A)

VICE-CHAIRMAN.