

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

CM.No.060/01041/2015 in  
R.A.No.060/00068/2015 in  
O.A.No.060/00750/2014

Date of Decision : 08.10.2015

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, JUDICIAL MEMBER  
HON'BLE MRS. RAJWANT SANDHU, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

Jaspreet Singh, s/o Mohinder Singh, r/o VPO Badhai, Tehsil & District Muktsar.

Applicant

Versus

1. Chief Post Master General, Punjab Postal Services, Sandesh Bhawan, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
2. Supdt. Of Post Offices, Faridkot Postal Division, Faridkot (Pb.).
3. The S.D.I. (P), Sub Division, Muktsar.
4. Gurvinder Singh, s/o Gurdip Singh, c/o Shinder Pal Singh, Mail Overseer, VPO, Badhai, Tehsil & District Muktsar.
5. Shinder Pal Singh, Mail Overseers, SDI (P) Office, Muktsar, Sub Division, Muktsar.

Respondents

**(ORDER in Circulation)**

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

1. This Review Application has been filed under Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Section 114 and Order 47 of the CPC, seeking review of order dated 10.08.2015 through which the OA was decided. *As* \_\_\_\_\_

2. CM No.060/01041/2015 has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condoning the delay of 19 days in filing the application for review of the order dated 10.08.2015 annexed as Annexure A-1.
3. In the RA, the applicant has stated that on 06.08.2015 Sh. S.C. Arora, Advocate, was not able to reach in time for arguing the matter before the Bench. Rule 15 of the C.A.T. (Procedure) Rules, 1987 had been incorrectly invoked while deciding the matter.
4. It is also stated that the applicant had specifically alleged in the OA that respondent no.5 who holds an influential position in the respondent Department got his son-in-law i.e. respondent no.4 selected for the post of GDS which order was under challenge. In the judgment, while this fact has been mentioned in the version of the applicant, but this was not discussed while arriving at conclusion or its effect on the merits of the case.
5. Regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> ground taken by the applicant, it is observed that the counsel for the applicant did not put in appearance even on the 2<sup>nd</sup> call and since the OA was listed for arguments, the Bench had acted in accordance with the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987 while invoking Rule 15 of these Rules and had proceeded to decide the matter.
6. Regarding the second contention of the applicant in the RA it is stated that the matter was decided on merits taking into account the pleadings of

As \_\_\_\_\_

the parties and the material on the record. This RA therefore appears to be an attempt to seek rehearing of the whole matter which is not within the scope of an RA as per Order 47 Rule 1 of the CPC.

7. Hence, this RA being without merit is rejected.  
CMNo.060/01041/2015 is also disposed of accordingly.

**(RAJWANT SANDHU)  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)  
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Place: Chandigarh  
Dated: 08.10.2015

sv:

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
CHANDIGARH BENCH

REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 060/00068/15 OF \_\_\_\_\_ IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION/TAN NO. 060/00250/2014

Jaspreet Surl APPLICANT (S)

VERSUS

union

Postal RESPONDENT(S)

The Review Application under reference has been submitted to the Tribunal by post/personally by Mr. S.C. Arora under Section 22(J) of the Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 read with rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal Rules of Procedure Rules, 1987 and is for Review of Judgment delivered by the Bench dated 10/8/2015

The Review Application has been scrutinized in the light of provisions contained in the Act and the Rules and has been found be in order.

The Review Application may be submitted to Hon'ble Member Mr. Sanjeev Kaurh Member (J) AND Hon'ble Mr. Mr. Rajwant Member (A) for appropriate orders by circulation.

Sharma  
28/9/15  
SECTION OFFICER (JUDL)

DEPUTY REGISTRAR / PPS - on leave

REGISTRAR

Hon'ble Member (J)/(HOD)

Hon'ble Member (A/I)

Hon'ble Member (A/I)

Hon'ble Member (J/I)

28/9/15  
8/10/2015  
Draft Order rejecting the RA is placed below for consideration  
Hon'ble Member (J)

Re  
8/10/2015