

18

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL : HYDERABAD BENCH
AT HYDERABAD

RA 38/99 in OA 1342/97

DATE OF ORDER : 1-7-1999.

Between :-

1. V.S.Rajan	9. Y.Bala Sundaram
2. M.N.Murthy	10.R.K.Acharya
3. V.J.Meyya	11.B.Subba Rao
4. E.L.S.E.Prasad	12.R.P.Venkateshalam
5. V.Mani	13.P.A.Premanathan
6. G.Sai Baba	14.C.John Anthony
7. P.V.Subba Rao	15.V.Dikshithulu
8. V.K.Nayar	

... Applicants

And

1. The Union of India, rep. by its Secretary, M/o Personnel & Training, New Delhi-2.
2. The Financial Advisor, Defence Services, M/o Defence (Finance), New Delhi.
3. The Controller General of Defence Accounts, R.K.Puram, New Delhi.
4. The Controller of Defence Accounts, Staff Road, Sec'bad-9.

... Respondents

--- --- --

Counsel for the Applicant : Shri A.Venkateshwara Sarma

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri V.Rajeshwar Rao, CGSC

--- --- --

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE SHRI R.RANGARAJAN : MEMBER (A)

THE HON'BLE SHRI B.S.JAI PARAMESHWAR : MEMBER (J)

R (Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

D

--- --- --

19

(Order per Hon'ble Shri R.Rangarajan, Member (A)).

-- -- --

Heard Sri A.Venkateswara Sarma, counsel for the applicants and Sri V.Rajeshwar Rao, Standing Counsel for Respondents.

2. The applicants in the O.A. filed this R.A. The affidavit is only a half page affidavit bringing out no error on the face of the judgement. It is only stated that as the date of hearing was not correctly noted, arguments could not be submitted on behalf of the petitioners and the grounds mentioned in the Review Application separately be taken as part of this affidavit. There is no Review Application indicating error on the face of the judgement. The reasons for disposing of the O.A. under Rule 15(2) has been clearly indicated in para-1 of the judgement. It has been clearly stated that on that day neither the applicants nor the counsels were present when the OAs had come up for hearing. Number of times this case was listed and on all the occasions neither the counsel nor the applicants were present. When the MASR 1977/98 in OA 145/97 was disposed of on 2.2.1999 then also neither the applicant nor his counsel was present. When the counsel or the applicants themselves ^{were} ~~are~~ repeatedly absent when the matter was listed, it cannot be said that the applicants were not heard.

R

1