

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
CHANDIGARH BENCH,
CHANDIGARH.**

R.A.No.060/00020/2015 in
O.A.No.060/00747/2014

Date of Decision : 30.4.2015
Reserved on : 27.04.2015

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. RAJWANT SANDHU, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER
HON'BLE DR. BRAHM A. AGRAWAL, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

S.K. Khanna

Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Ors.

Respondents

Present: Applicant in person

Mr. Rohit Sharma, counsel for the respondents

ORDER


HON'BLE MRS. RAJWANT SANDHU, MEMBER (A)

1. This Review Application has been filed under Section 22 (3) (f) of the AT Act, 1985 read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, for review of order dated 23.02.2015 (Annexure RA-1). It has been stated in the RA that the Tribunal disposed of OA No.060/00747/2014 vide order dated 29.08.2014 with a direction to respondent no.1 to consider and take a view on the representation (Annexure A-14) in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The respondent no.1 as per their own statement in para 3 of their MA No.060/01611/2014 received the order of this Tribunal on 19.09.2014 and therefore in compliance on the directions of the Tribunal were required to decide the representation of the applicant on or before 18.11.2014. The respondent no.1 did not dispose of the representation within time granted

As —

and filed MA No.060/01612/2014 for extension of time for 8 weeks after the expiry of the time granted to them. Through his reply to the MA filed on 04.01.2015, the applicant opposed the request of respondent no.1 by filing reply to the MA submitting inter-alia that the MA was filed by Sh. Mayank Bansal, Assistant P.F Commissioner, Chandigarh who is not a Central Government employee but of the autonomous body and thus has no locus standi to file the same on behalf of Union of India. The respondents had not approached the Tribunal before the expiry of time allowed by the Tribunal but after the expiry of the time allowed by the Tribunal.

2. The MA for extension of time was filed in respect of the order dated 29.08.2014 passed by the DB of Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J) and Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A). The grounds raised in the reply to the MA appear to have escaped notice of this Tribunal resulting into allowing the MA and thus the order is required to be recalled / reviewed.

3. The applicant in the MA has been heard when he pressed the grounds taken in the RA. Sh. Rohit Sharma, learned counsel for the respondents in the OA stated that the speaking order dated 13.02.2015 had been passed by the competent authority complying with the order dated 29.08.2014 in OA No.060/00747/2014.  .

4. We have given our careful consideration to the matter. It is a fact that the order dated 29.08.2014 was passed by the Bench comprising of Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J) and Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A). Also the order dated 23.02.2015 i.e. the subject of the RA has been passed without hearing the applicant Sh. S.K. Khanna. Hence, the order dated 23.02.2015 is recalled and the matter may be placed before the Bench comprising of Hon'ble Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Member (J) and Hon'ble Mr. Uday Kumar Varma, Member (A) for further consideration. The RA stands allowed. Matter may be listed before DB-I on 05.05.2015.

(RAJWANT SANDHU)
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER.

(DR. BRAHM A. AGRAWAL)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

Place: Chandigarh

Dated: 30.4.2015 .

SV: