

14
BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BOMBAY BENCH

...

R.P.No. 68/94

in

O.A.No. 1113

Shri Jairaj Arokiaswamy

... Applicant

v/s

Union of India & Ors.

... Respondents

Tribunal's order on Review Petition No. 68/94

Dated:

This review petition is filed against the order and judgment dated 16.2.1994 in O.A. No. 1113/93 rejecting the application for change of date of birth. I have carefully perused the petition and the application for condonation of delay in filing the review petition.

2. The applicant has not pointed out any error apparent on the face of the record. All the grounds raised in the petition have also been raised at the time when the O.A. was considered and the applicant was heard in support of the O.A. The applicant's grievance is that the order dated 16.2.1994 is erroneous but that ground cannot be a ground for a review of the order. There is no error apparent on the face of the record or any other grounds justifying review of the order. The Supreme Court has held in Chandra Kanta and Another v. Sheik Habib [AIR 1975 SC 1500] that once

an order has been passed by the Court, a review thereof must be subject to the rules of the game and cannot be lightly entertained. Hence, this petition is liable to be rejected.

3. There is also delay in filing the review petition. Rule 17(1) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 provides as follows:-

" No application for review shall be entertained unless it is filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of copy of the order sought to be reviewed".

4. In the result, this review petition is dismissed under rule 17 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987 read with rule 49, Appdix IV Para II(b) of CAT Rules of Practice, 1993.

Lakshmi Swaminathan
(Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (Judicial)