

HYDERABAD BENCH : AT HYDERABAD

T.A.No.

Petitioner.

Versus

Respondent.

Advocate for the Respondent (s)

THE HON'BLE MR. R. Balasubramanian, Member (A)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?
5. Remarks of Vice Chairman on columns 1, 2, 4
(To be submitted to Hon'ble Vice Chairman where he is not on the Bench)

HRBS

HTCR

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

Review Petn. No.41/92

in

O.A. No. 398 of 1989

Date of order: 19 -3-1992.

Between

Md.A.Gaffoor

... Applicant/Applicant

and

1. The District Engineer,
Telephones, Visakhapatnam.

2. The Asst.Engineer,
Telephones-III, Visakhapatnam

... Respondents/Respondents

Appearance

For the applicant : Mr.P.Sri Raghuram, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr.N.Bhaskara Rao, Addl.CGSC

CORAM

Hon'ble Shri R.Balasubramanian, Member (Admn.)

Hon'ble Shri T.Chandrasekhar Reddy, Member (Judl.)

ORDER OF THE BENCH PASSED IN CIRCULATION

This Review Petition is filed by Shri Md.A. Gaffoor against the District Engineer, Telephones, Visakhapatnam and another seeking a review of the judgment dated 23-1-1992 of this Bench in O.A. No.398/89.

contd...2.

21

P.1
21

2. In this Review Petition ^{the applicant} ~~he~~ has not pointed out any error apparent in the judgment. The plea in this review petition is that since ^{his counsel} ~~he~~ could not argue the case and since he is now prepared to argue the case on merits, the case may be heard again. On this ground he wants a review of the order dated 23-1-1992.

3. We have clearly indicated in para 4 of the judgment the circumstances under which we had examined the case on merits even in the absence of the counsel for the applicant. Enjoying as he did an interim order, he never cared to turn up despite several opportunities given to him and ^{it} ~~he~~ does not lie in his mouth now to come and plead for one more chance ^{after the judgment is pronounced.} Besides, the case was not dismissed for default. The merits of the case were gone into and the case was dismissed on merits. Under these circumstances, we do not find any scope for review and dismiss the Review Petition with no order as to costs.

R. Balasubramanian
(R. Balasubramanian)
Member (Admn.)

T. Chandrasekhar Reddy
(T. Chandrasekhar Reddy)
Member (Judl.)

Dated: ^{19th} ~~10th~~ day of March, 1992. *S29/3/92*
By Registrar (J)

mhb/

To

1. The District Engineer, Telephones, Visakhapatnam.
2. The Asst. Engineer, Telephones-III, Visakhapatnam.
3. One copy to Mr. P. SriRaghuram, Advocate,
Plot No. 1361, Road No. 45, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad.
4. One copy to Mr. N. Bhaskar Rao, Addl. CGSC. CAT. Hyd.
5. One spare copy.

pvm

Notes
20/3/92
82 Chok
24/3

2

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR.

V.C.

THE HON'BLE MR. R. BALASUBRAMANIAN: M(A)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. T. CHANDRASEKHAR REDDY;
M(JUDL)

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. C. J. ROY : MEMBER(JUDL)

Central Administrative Tribunal
DESPATCH

2-4-92²²

DATED: 19-3-1992 HYDERABAD BENCH.

ORDER/JUDGMENT:

R.A/C.A/M.A.No.

in

O.A.No.

398/89

T.A.No.

(W.P.No.

Admitted and interim directions
issued.

Allowed

Disposed of with directions.

RR Dismissed

Dismissed as withdrawn

Dismissed for Default.

M.A. Ordered/ Rejected

No order as to costs.

[Signature]