

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

**RA-184/2016
In
OA 340/2010**

New Delhi this the 26th day of May, 2017

**Hon'ble Sh. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)
Hon'ble Sh. Raj Vir Sharma, Member (J)**

Sh. Vinod Kumar Yagic
S/o Sh. Shri Ram Baboo Yagic
Postal Assistant, Agra Gort,
Head Post Office, Agra

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. G S Lobana)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through Secretary
Ministry of Communication and IT
Department of Posts,
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.

 2. The Director Postal Services
O/o the Post Master General
Agra

 3. The Senior Supdt. Of Post Office
Jhansi Division, Jhansi.
- .. Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Mr. Shekhar Agarwal, Member (A)

This Review Application is directed against our order dated 13.07.2016 by which the OA was dismissed. Notice was issued to the opposite side in this case which was accepted by Sh. Gyanendra Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the UOI on 21.03.2017 on our directions. It was made clear to Sh. Gyanendra Singh that as a last chance he was being granted time to file reply/make submissions on the next date of hearing. When this case was taken up on 26.05.2017 none was present on behalf of the respondents. Hence, the RA was heard ex parte.

2. We have perused the RA and have heard learned counsel for the Review Applicant Sh. G.S. Lobana. We find that the grounds taken in the Review

Application mostly pertain to the merits of the case. In particular Sh. Lobana argued that since there was no pecuniary loss to the respondents, the question of recovery from the applicant should not have arisen. However, we find from our judgment that this issue has been dealt with in para 8 wherein it has been observed that SBI had raised demand of Rs. 8,80,000/- on account of encashment of forged drafts. Thus, it is evident that there is no force in the contention of the Review Applicant that there was no pecuniary loss to the Govt.

3. No other ground was pressed before us. In our opinion, the Review Applicant was only trying to re-argue the matter in the garb of this RA. Clearly this is beyond the scope of the Review. No error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed out by the Review Applicant. Thus, there is no merit in this Review and the same is dismissed.

(Raj Vir Sharma)
Member (J)

(Shekhar Agarwal)
Member (A)

/sarita/