

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH:  
AT HYDERABAD.

M.A.No.505 of 1997  
In  
R.A.SR.No.1315 of 1997  
In  
O.A.No.87 of 1993

Date of Order:- 3-4-1998

BETWEEN :

1. Union of India
2. Director-General,  
Geological Survey of India,  
Calcutta.
3. Dy. Director General,  
Geological Survey of India,  
Southern Region, Hyderabad.



... Petitioners/  
Respondents.

AND

1. S.C. Deb
2. A. Suryanarayana
3. Radhakrishnan Punjabi
4. M.A. Kareem
5. Namita Ray
6. Syed Hder
7. M. Jagannadham

... Respondents/  
Applicants.

ORDER.

DATE: 3-4-1998.

The respondents in the O.A. have filed an application for review of the order dated 2.1.1997 passed in the O.A.No.87/93. They have filed the application on 25.4.1997.

2. There is a delay of 68 days in filing the R.A.

3. Hence they have filed this M.A. to condone the delay of 68 days in the affidavit filed along with the M.A. It is stated that on receipt of the order in the O.A. they realised that the O.A. was decided without their counter; that the said fact was not within their knowledge; that since the Tribunal has granted the reliefs to the applicants in the O.A. without considering their counter - without going into the merits and demerits of the case -, the matter was

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: HYDERABAD BENCH :  
AT HYDERABAD.

M.A.NO.505/97

In

RA SR.No.1315/97

In

O.A.No.87/93.

Date of order :- 3-4-1998

BETWEEN :

1. Union of India
2. Director General, Geological Surevey of India,  
Calcutta.
3. Dy. Director General, Geological Survey of India,  
Southern Region, Hyderabad.

... Petitioners/  
Respondents

AND

1. S.C. Deb
2. A. Suryanarayana
3. Radhakrishnan Punjabi
4. M.A. Kareem
5. Namita Ray
6. Syed Hyder
7. M. Jagannadham

... Respondents/  
Applicants.

Counsel for Petitioners : Mr. N.R. Devaraj, CGSC

Counsel for Respondents : Mr. V. Venkateswara Rao

CORAM : Hon. Mr. R. Rangarajan, Member (Admn.)  
Hon. Mr. B. S. Jai Parameshwar, Member (Judl.)

O R D E R.

The respondents in the O.A. have filed an application for review of the order dated 2.1.1997 passed in the O.A.No.87/93. They have filed the application on 25.4.1997.

2. There is a delay of 68 days in filing the R.A.

3. Hence they have filed this M.A. to condone the delay of 68 days in the affidavit filed along with the M.A. It is stated that on receipt of the order in the O.A. they realised that the O.A. was decided without their counter; that the said fact was not within their knowledge; that since the Tribunal has granted the reliefs to the applicants in the O.A. without considering their counter- without going into the merits and the demerits of the case -, the matter was

Jun

11. The respondents have not explained properly the delay of 68 days caused in filing the Review Application. The respondents have filed the affidavit in the M.A. in a casual manner without giving the necessary details.

12. Hence we are not convinced to condone the delay of 68 days. The respondents have not explained the sufficient or convincing reasons for the delay. Therefore, the M.A.No.505/97 is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed.

13. Accordingly R.A.SR.No.1315 of 1997 also stands rejected.

प्रमाणित प्रति  
CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY  
*[Signature]*  
न्यायालय जजिस्टरी/उप रजिस्ट्रार (न्यायिक)  
Court Officer/Dy. Registrar  
केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण  
Central Administrative Tribunal  
हैदराबाद न्यायपीठ  
HYDERABAD BENCH

केस संख्या	MA 505/97. in
CASE NUMBER	R.A.SR.1315/97
निर्णय का तारीख	
Date of Judgment	3-4-98
कॉपी मदन	15-4-98
अनुभाग जजिस्टरी (न्यायिक) (न्यायिक)	
Section Officer (J) Dy. Registrar (J)	

of the record. However, this Tribunal made observation that the order in the M.A. categorically indicated that the respondents had not filed any reply.

7. The R.A.46/96 came to be rejected on the ground that the applicants in the R.A. had not submitted any objections to the delay condonation application(M.A. No.583/95). The view taken by this Tribunal in the said M.A. is squarely applicable to the facts of this case.

In this case also the applicants in the R.A. though given sufficient opportunity of about nearly 3 years and odd failed to submit any reply. They have not disclosed any reasons for not filing any reply to the O.A. Their lapse in not filing any reply to the O.A. cannot be overcome by seeking a review of the order and the applicants in the R.A. could not point out any error apparent on the face of the record in the order passed by this Tribunal on 2.1.1997. As the applicants had failed to submit any reply to the O.A. we feel that in the absence of satisfactory explanation, they cannot file an application for review on the ground that there is an error apparent on the face of the record.

8. In this view of the matter, we feel that the R.A.SR filed by the applicants may not be entertainable.

9. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the RA need not be rejected on the ground that the counter was not filed in the OA as it involves revision of the entire structure and thereby involves huge expenditure to the Government.

10. The yardstick under which law will be applied will be the same whether it involves huge expenditure or otherwise.