

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH,  
JAIPUR.

R.P.No.80/93

Dt. of order: 10.12.1993

Dr.Sudhir Malhotra : Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India & Ors. : Respondents

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr.B.B.Mahajan, Member(Adm.)

Hon'ble Mr.Gopal Krishna, Member(Judl.).

PER HON'BLE MR.GOPAL KRISHNA, MEMBER(JUDL.)

Petitioner Dr.Sudhir Malhotra, has sought a review of the order passed by this Tribunal on 26.8.93 in O.A.No.66/92 on the ground that there is an error on the face of the record since there has been two inconsistent orders in two similar cases. The case of the petitioner is stated to be identical to that of Dr.Priya Thawani, in which all other consequential benefits which are available to the Doctors mentioned in the order dated 17.8.92 were extended to her whereas in the case of the petitioner it was ordered that all other consequential benefits which are available to the Doctors mentioned in the order dated 17.8.92 shall also be extended to the applicant except ~~be~~ that he will not be entitled to wages for the period from termination of his services to regularisation. The petitioner further states that he is entitled to receive his back wages since back wages were allowed to Dr.(Mrs.) Priya Thawani vide order of this Tribunal dated 12.8.93 in O.A. No.318/92. The grounds on which a review of the impugned decision is claimed does not amount to an error apparent on the face of the record. Such grounds do not justify a review of the order in question. The review petition is, therefore, dismissed in limine under Rule 17(3) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987.

*Gopal Krishna*  
(Gopal Krishna)  
Member(Judl.).

*B.B. Mahajan*  
(B.B.Mahajan)  
Member(Adm.).