

(9)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI BENCH

R.P. NO.: 55/95 IN O.A. No. 252/94.

Dated this Friday, the 15th day of November, 1996.

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI B. S. HEGDE, MEMBER (J).

HON'BLE SHRI P. P. SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER (A).

1. Union Of India through
General Manager,
Central Railway,
Bombay V.T.
2. The Divisional Railway
Manager,
Central Railway,
Bombay V.T.
3. The Senior Divisional
Electrical Engineer (G),
Central Railway,
Bombay V.T.
(By Advocate Shri V.G. Rege).

... Applicant

(Original respondents
in O.A. No. 252/94).

VERSUS

1. Shri M. N. Nair,
Ganesh Niwas,
Bombay Pune Highway Road,
Kolsewadi, Kalyan (East).
(By Advocate Shri K.B. Talreja)

... Respondent

(Original applicant in
O.A. No. 252/94).

: ORDER :

Heard Shri V.G. Rege for the Review Petitioner
and Shri K. B. Talreja for the original applicant.


2. Shri Talreja for the original applicant submits
that the suspension order was issued by the original
respondents in view of the criminal prosecution pending against


him and accordingly he was suspended on 26.06.1986.

The Tribunal after hearing both the parties, passed the following order on 01.07.1994 :

"We, therefore, direct that the suspension of the applicant shall be deemed to have been revoked from the date on which the penalty was imposed. The respondents shall work out the applicant's entitlement for pecuniary benefit which would flow from the above position within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and pay the amount according to rules, within two months thereafter."

Pursuant to this order, the original respondents revoked the suspension order vide dated 14.11.1994 and reinstated him in the same grade and capacity under SS(TL)/VT vide The applicant superannuated from service on 31.12.1994. its order dated 16.11.1994. / The review petition is filed on 30.03.1995 after a lapse of 8 months. As per rules, the review petition has to be filed within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. However, that is not the case here. Since the original respondents (Review Petitioners) have already implemented the order, the question of entertaining the Review Petition at this stage does not arise. Accordingly, the Review Petition is disposed of.


(P.P. SRIVASTAVA)
MEMBER (A).


(B. S. HEGDE)
MEMBER (J).