

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

GULESTAN BLDG. NO.6, PRESCOT ROAD, 4TH FLOOR,
MUMBAI - 400 001.

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.65/1996 IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.861/1995

MONDAY, THIS THE 6TH DAY OF MAY, 1996

CORAM : HON'BLE SHRI V. RAMAKRISHNAN .. MEMBER (A)

K.V. Prasad Rao, ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India through
The Finance Secretary, (C&C),
Ministry of Finance,
Department of Economic Affairs,
North Block, New Delhi - 110 001.

2. The Deputy General Manager,
India Security Press,
Nasik Road - 422 101. ... Respondents

O R D E R

This review application seeking a review of the orders passed by me in Mumbai Bench is disposed of by circulation.

2. The applicant, Shri Prasad Rao has sought for a review of the Tribunal's order rendered on 8.3.1996, in O.A. No.861/95. In that O.A., the applicant had come up with a number of prayers but had eventually confined himself to grant of Over time allowance for two days on 11.4.95 and 12.4.95. As the respondents had stated that as per official records, he had not worked on those days, it was held that the burden was on the applicant to produce convincing material to establish that he had in fact worked on those days. He was directed to submit a detailed representation to the authority concerned, who was Respondent No.2, along with necessary evidence

in support of his claim and the OA was disposed of accordingly.

3. The order was dictated in the open court in the presence of the applicant who had argued the case in person. The applicant, in fact, undertook to submit such a representation within one week and from the Exhibit 'C' dated 13.3.1996, annexed to the present review application, it is seen that he had sent some communication in this regard to the authorities.

4. The applicant has submitted the present review application citing some grounds. These grounds are not clear. There is ~~only an~~ ^{an} allegation that the respondents are harassing him and are disregarding the orders of the Tribunal. Without going into the merits of such allegation, it is evident that the applicant cannot pursue the present grievance by means of a review application. He has not brought out any error apparent on the face of the record in the judgment of the Tribunal dated 8.3.1996.

5. The review application is devoid of merit and is dismissed.

Dra. Ramakrishnan
(V. RAMAKRISHNAN)
MEMBER (A)

ppp.

22.6.1996
order/Judgement despatched
to Appellant/Respondent(s)
on 24/6/96

24/6/96