

22

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCH

MA. 97/89 & R.A. ^{SN} No. 400 of 1999
In
O.A. No. 41 of 1994

This the 8 day of March, 1999.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice K.M. Agarwal, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. H. Rajendra Prasad, Member(A)

The Union of India
represented by the Director General,
Telecommunications,
New Delhi & 2 others.

Applicants.

vs.

A. Jaya D/o Late A. Rama Rao,
Telephone Operator,
Saifabad Telephone Exchange,
Hyderabad and 81 others.

Respondents.

Counsel for the applicant ...
Counsel for the Respondent ...

Mr. V. Rajwade Rao
Mr. J. Jayarama Rao

ORDER (IN CIRCULATION)

JUSTICE K.M. AGARWAL:

This Review Application has been filed for reviewing our order dated 29.4.1997 in O.A. No. 41/94, A. Jaya & ors. vs. Union of India & ors. The case was decided on the basis of the statement made by the learned counsel for the applicants and the learned Standing counsel for the department in O.A. No. 41/94 that the case was covered by a decision of Ernakulam Bench of this Tribunal in O.A. No. 1784/92 dated 24.5.1993 and similar other petitions decided by various other Benches of the Tribunal. Now the present Review Application is based on the judgement dated 1.8.1997 of the Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 80123 of 1996 along with CA Nos. 5268 of 1997; 124/96; 124-125/96; 127-130/96 and 131/96 in the case of Union of India & Another Vs. K.N. Siva Das & Ors. Admittedly this Review Application is belated and that the judgement of the Supreme Court was not in existence on the date we delivered our order in O.A. No. 41/94 on the basis of a common statement made by the learned counsel for the parties that the case was covered by similar other

Jm

cases decided by various other Benches of the Tribunal. Under these circumstances, we are of the view that no case is made out for reviewing our order dated 29.4.1997 in O.A. No.41/94. If the ground urged for reviewing the order is upheld, it is bound to result in unnecessary complications of various nature. To illustrate one, in such a situation all past decisions of any High Court or Tribunal which go contrary to the later decision of the Supreme Court may have to be reviewed and reversed on the basis of similar applications for review.

2. According to us, there is no error apparent on the face of the record of O.A.No.41/94. The Review Application is misconceived. It is also barred by time and, therefore, it is hereby dismissed. The parties may be informed accordingly.

K.M. Agarwal
8.3.99
(K.M. AGARWAL) *was odhi*
CHAIRMAN

H. Rajendra Prasad
(H. RAJENDRA PRASAD)
MEMBER (A)

Ar. 11-3-99
11-3-99