CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA 183/2016 in OA 4392/2012

New Delhi, this the 6th day of September, 2016

Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Basu, Member (A) Hon'ble Dr. Brahm Avtar Agrawal, Member (J)

- 1. Z. Tirkey S/o Late Shri S. Tirkey 839UG-4, Aman Residency Shalimar Garden Ext. I Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, U.P.
- Pawan Jindal S/o Shri B.K. Jindal General Secretary, All India DGQA Engineers Assn. C-356, Saraswati Vihar, Delhi-110034
- 3. S.C. Garhwal S/o Shri M.C. Garhwal B-251-A, New Ashok Nagar Delhi-110096Appl

....Applicants

Versus

- Union of India
 Through the Secretary
 Dept. of Defence Production,
 Ministry of Defence,
 South Block, New Delhi-110011
- Director General, Quality Assurance Dept. of Defence Production Ministry of Defence South Block, New Delhi-110011
- Controller of Quality Assurance (VEHS) PB No.2
 Dept. of Defence Production Ministry of Defence (DGQA) Ahmednagar-414003
- 4. Shri A.A. Koda, AE (DA) C/o SQAE (V), DGQA Complex, Ministry of Defence, Hashings Kolkata-700022
- 5. Shri Pandi Selva Durai C/o the Controller COA (HV), Avadi

Chennai, Tamilnadu

- 6. Shri M.K. Kadekar C/o SQAE (U), DGQA Complex, Ministry of Defence, Hashings Kolkata-700022
- 7. Shri K. Chellamuthu C/oSQAE (V), Badarpur, New Delhi-44
- 8. Shri Manoj Kumar Singh, HQ, DQAV, Ministry of Defence DGQA, New Delhi-110011
- 9. Shri Giridhar Gopal Patware C/o CQA (V) Aurangabad Road, Ahmednagar
- 10. Shri A.V. Parate, The Controller, CQA (OFV), Jabalpur, M.P.
- 11. Shri Baban Singh
 C/o HQ/ DQAV
 Ministry of Defence
 New Delhi-110011
- 12. Satyapal Lakhtakiya SQAE (V) Badarpur, New Delhi

... Respondents

Service effected for respondent no.4 to 12 through
Director General, Quality Assurance
Dept. of Defence Production
Ministry of Defence, South Block
New Delhi-110011

ORDER (In Circulation)

Mr. P.K. Basu, Member (A)

This Review Application (RA) has been filed against the order dated 9.05.2016 passed by us in OA 4392/2012 and against order dated 4.08.2016 passed in MA 1832/2016.

2. We have gone through the RA. We do not find anything in RA which suggests an error apparent on the face of the record or

any other sufficient reason for a review. In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has settled the law. We refer, in particular, to the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati and others, (2013) 8 SCC 320 and State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamalsengupta and another, (2008) 8 SCC 612.

3. The RA being an attempt to reargue the case, cannot be entertained. It is, therefore, dismissed in circulation.

(Dr. Brahm Avtar Agrawal) (P.K. Basu) Member (J) Member (A)

/dkm/