

**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi.**

**RA-178/2017  
MA-2714/2017 in  
OA-934/2016**

**New Delhi this the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2017.**

**Hon'ble Mr. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)**

Sh. H.K. Sharma aged about 85 years  
S/o late Sh. Raman Lal,  
R/o 13-C, Surya Apartments,  
Sector-13, Rohini, Delhi-85.

.... Review Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through  
The Secretary, Ministry of  
Communication & I.T.,  
Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,  
New Delhi-110001.
2. Department of Telecommunication,  
20, Ashoka Road, Sanchar Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110001.
3. Central Pension Accounting Office  
Through the Secretary Ministry of Finance,  
Government of India, Bhikaji Cama Place,  
New Delhi-110066.
4. Union Bank of India,  
14/15-F, Connaught Place,  
New Delhi-110002,  
Through its Manager.

..... Respondents

**O R D E R (BY CIRCULATION)**

MA-2714/2017 has been filed for condonation of delay in filing  
RA-178/2017 in OA-934/2016. For the reasons stated therein, the  
same is allowed.

2. This Review Application is directed against my order dated 05.01.2017, the operative part of which reads as follows:-

“5. In view of the above, I allow this O.A. partly and set aside the order dated 27.12.2014 passed by respondent No.4. I further direct that no recovery shall be made from the applicant pursuant to orders dated 11.06.2014 of respondent No.2 and 26.03.2014 of respondent No.3. No costs.”

3. The contention of the review applicant is that this Tribunal committed an error by not directing the respondents to refund to the applicant the amount of Rs. 51,000/- + arrears recovered from him pursuant to their impugned orders.

4. I have considered the aforesaid submission and have also perused the O.A. I find that refund of the amount already recovered was neither asked for nor was allowed by this Tribunal. Hence, additional relief is being asked for in the review application, which is not permissible under law. Even the judgments relied upon by the applicant lay down that recovery from retired employees was impermissible under law. Nowhere in those judgments, it has been laid down that the amount already recovered has to be refunded. Thus, I do not find any error in my order, which needs rectification. The review application being devoid of merit is rejected in circulation.

**(Shekhar Agarwal)**  
**Member (A)**

/vinita/

