

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

R.P.No.109/96 in OA.NO. 1366/94

Monday this the 17th day of February, 1997

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri P.P.Srivastava, Member (A)

Union of India & Ors. ... Applicants
V/S.

Smt. S.G.Mantri ... Respondent

Tribunal's Order by Circulation

In this Review Petition the petitioners have brought out that there was no permanent post from the date of appointment till the year 1983. They have also brought out that the applicant never held any post on a substantive/permanent basis. The Review Applicant has mentioned that this information was not available during the hearing of the OA. This submission does not seem to be factually correct. The petitioner has brought out in their reply to OA. in Para 12 that the applicant's case was considered for confirmation during May, 1985 but she was not found fit for confirmation. These submissions in written statement are similar to the above assertions.

2. Moreover, the information was not such as it could not have been produced at the time of original hearing with due diligence. The Review Petition has not brought out any error apparent on the face of record. The Review Petition is, therefore, dismissed in limine.


(P.P.SRIVASTAVA)
MEMBER (A)

mrj.