

BEFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
MUMBAI BENCH, MUMBAI

R.P.NO. 17/97 in OA.NO. 281/95

Dated this the 18th day of Feb. 1997

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

Union of India & Ors.

... Applicants

V/S.

Rakesh Nagar

... Respondent

Tribunal's Order By Circulation

The Review Petitioners have submitted that there is an error apparent on the face of the record in as much as the Regional Rural Banks are not financed wholly or substantially, i.e. more than 50% from the Central Government and therefore they cannot be treated as Central Autonomous bodies.


2. Another point which has been brought out in the review petition is that the applicant has not joined the Kshetriya Gramin Bank as party respondents in the OA and if the said Bank was joined as Party Respondent then the said Bank would have come out with a different situation and would have placed on record their status in law. The main thrust of the argument here is that the Gramin Banks are commercial organisations and cannot be treated as Central Autonomous bodies as they are generally a non-profit making organisations.

3. These issues have been discussed in the judgement and the final decision arrived at in the judgement is at Para 8 wherein the Tribunal has held that :-



"the character of the Regional Rural Bank is certainly that of a Central statutory body and the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court referred to in para above leaves no doubt that the Regional Rural Banks are under deep and pervasive control of the Central Government and have been established as its instrumentality and in view of this, the clarification given by the Department of Personnel cannot be accepted."

4. I am, therefore, of the view that the Review Petitioner has not brought out anything new which would warrant any review of the judgement. The material which has been termed as error apparent on the face of record is not so but it is the material which brings out arguments as to why this judgement rendered by the Tribunal cannot be sustained. These arguments cannot be utilised for the purpose of review as it is well understood that the scope of review is very limited. The Review Petition is, therefore, dismissed in limine.

  
(P.P. SRIVASTAVA)  
MEMBER (A)

mrj.

dd-18/4/97  
order/Judgement despatched  
to Applicant/Respondent (s)  
on 27/4/97

28/4/97