

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH,
JABALPUR

Review Application No. 89 of 2004
(In O.A. No. 134 of 2003)

Indore, this the 10th day of January, 2005

Hon'ble Shri M.P. Singh, Vice Chairman
Hon'ble Shri Madan Mohan, Judicial Member

Union of India & Ors. Applicants

(By Advocate – Shri B.da.Silva)

V e r s u s

Vinod P. Shyam Respondent

(By Advocate – Shri A.P. Shrivastava)

O R D E R

By Madan Mohan, Judicial Member –

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. By filing this Review Application the applicants have prayed to review the order dated 15th June, 2004 passed in OA No. 134/2003. In this Review Application the applicants have mentioned in paragraph 7 “that this Tribunal vide its order dated 15th June, 2004, allowed the Original Application after observing that “the learned counsel for the official respondent has produced one letter dated 22.1.2004 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, Central Board of Direct Taxes, addressed to the Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhopal under the subject OA No. 134/2003 Vinod P. Shyam Vs. Union of India and others – clarification – regarding”. In fact the said letter was produced by the counsel for the applicant during the course of the final hearing, the said letter was not brought on record through any application and this Tribunal relying on the contents of the said document allowed the Original Application with retrospective effect”.




3. The learned counsel for the applicants in this Review Application argued that they have moved an application for condonation of delay.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on careful perusal of the records, we find that the applicants have prayed to review the order dated 15th June, 2004 passed in OA No. 134/2003. Copy of this judgment was received by the applicants on 21.6.2004 and the applicant has filed this present Review Application on 27.9.2004 while according to Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 no application for review shall be entertained unless it is filed within 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of the order sought to be reviewed. There is no provision for condonation of delay in the CAT (Procedure) Rules.

5. Hence, apparently this Review Application is filed beyond the period of limitation and is liable to be dismissed as barred by limitation. Accordingly, the Review Application is dismissed as barred by limitation.


(Madan Mohan)
Judicial Member


(M.P. Singh)
Vice Chairman

“SA”

पृष्ठांकन सं ओ/न्या.....जबलपुर, दि.....
प्रतिनिधि अर्पित:-

(1)के काउंसल

(2)के काउंसल

(3)के काउंसल

(4)के काउंसल

सचिवा एवं आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु

उप निदेश

Issued
On 24.01.05