

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH  
AT HYDERABAD

R.A.33/91  
in  
O.A. 451/90

Dt. of Order: 28-6-91.

R.Chandran

...Applicant/Applicant  
Vs.

1. The General Manager,  
SC Railway, Secunderabad.
2. The DRM (BG), SC Railway,  
Secunderabad.
3. Sr.DCS(BG), SC Railway,  
Secunderabad.
4. O.C.S.(BG), SC Railway,  
Secunderabad.

...Respondents/Respondents

- - - - -

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri M.C.Pillai

Counsel for the Respondents :

- - - - -

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.N.JAYASIMHA : VICE-CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE SHRI J.NARASIMHA MURTHY : MEMBER (J)

(Orders passed in circulation by Hon'ble  
Shri J.N.Murthy, Member (J) ).

- - - - -

This review petition is filed under section  
(f) of C.A.T.Act, 1985 under rule No.17 of C.A.T.Act, 1987.

The applicant in the Original Application No.451/90 has  
filed this Review Application aggrieved by the order court  
dt.11-4-1991. In his Review Petition he contends that the  
passengers were not examined and the Vigilance report was  
not made available to him. Further he contends that the  
rejoinder filed in the Original Application was not perused

by the court and the evidence was not properly appreciated. These are all the grounds raised in the Original Application and it is an admitted fact that the passenger travelled from Warangal to Balharshah in the first class without ticket. When the applicant caught the ticketless passenger and demanded for penalty, at one time the applicant states that the passenger has no money to pay towards the penalty. Then the applicant wanted to take necessary action at Balharshah. But on the other hand the applicant states that the passenger showed him a money bag but refused to pay the amount. When the money bag was shown to him it is his duty to collect the money then and there. When he is offering the receipt for the amount paid there is no meaning in not paying the amount to the applicant by the passenger who is travelling without ticket. In the grounds raised in the Review Application, the applicant is seeking to argue afresh the contentions already argued and dealt with in detail in the order dated 11.4.1991. In the alternative, he is seeking to contend that the conclusions of the Tribunal are wrong and that the Original Application should, therefore, be allowed. None of the grounds raised would in our view come within the scope of review. The grounds raised in the Review Petition are the grounds already raised in the Original Application. All the grounds were examined and passed the order in the Original Application. ~~.....~~

h/s

There is no new material placed before us for considering the case for review. So there are no merits to entertain the Review Petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

No costs.

*B.N.Jayashimha*  
(B.N.JAYASIMHA)  
Vice-Chairman

*MS*  
(J.NARASIMHA MURTHY)  
Member (J)

Dated: 28 June, 1991.

*8/7/91*  
Deputy Registrar(A)

av1/

To

1. The General Manager, S.C.Railway, Secunderabad.
2. The DRM (BG) S.C.Railway, Secunderabad.
3. Sr. DCS(BG) S.C.Railway, Secunderabad.
4. D.C.S.(BG) S.C.Railway, Secunderabad.
5. One copy to Mr.M.C.Pillai, Advocate, Flat No. 304, Kakatiya Apartments Street No.2. Habsiguda, Hyd-7
6. One copy to Mr. N.R.Devraj, SC for Rlys, CAT.Hyd.
7. One copy to Hon'ble Mr.J.Narasimha Murty, Member (J)CAT.Hyd.
8. One spare copy.

pvm

*Noted by  
SVM*

*31.12.91*

RVS  
5/7/91 (3)

poncp

TYPED BY

COMPARED BY

CHECKED BY

APPROVED BY

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
HYDRAABAD BENCH:HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. B. N. JAYASIMHA: V.C.  
AND

THE HON'BLE MR. D. SURYA BAO: M(J)  
AND

THE HON'BLE MR. J. NARASIMHA MURTHY: M(J)  
AND

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

DATED: 28/6/1991.

ORDER / JUDGMENT.

M.A./R.A./C.A. No. 33/91

in

T.A. No.

W.P. No.

O.A. No. 451/90

Admitted and Interim directions  
issued.

Allowed.

Disposed of with direction.

Dismissed.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Dismissed for default.

M.A. Ordered/Rejected.

No order as to costs.

