

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

R.A. No.193/2017
M.A. No.3092/2017
In
O.A. No.3122/2015

Tuesday, this the 26th day of September 2017

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. K.N. Shrivastava, Member (A)**

1. Union of India
Ministry of Home Affairs
Through the Secretary
North Block, New Delhi ..Applicant
(Mr. N D Kaushik, Advocate)

Versus

1. Mr. Yashpal Garg
DANICS
s/o Mr. Rambharosi Gupta
r/o 49 Delhi Govt. Flats
Greater Kailash-I, New Delhi – 48
2. Mr. Chokha Ram Garg
DANICS
s/o Mr. Hans Raj
r/o 695, New Residential Complex, Tihar Jail
Janak Puri, New Delhi – 54
3. Mr. Sanjeev Ahuja
DANICS
Aged 48 years
s/o Mr. Chota Singh
Asiad Village
New Delhi – 49
4. Mr. Prashant Kumar Panda
DANICS
r/o 69, Delhi Govt. Officers Flats
Greater Kailash I
New Delhi – 48
5. Sanjay Gihar
DANICS
A-110, Shivalik
New Delhi – 17
6. Sanjay Kumar Jha
DANICS
R/o B-3, Delhi Govt. Officers Residential Complex
Sector D-2, Vasant Kunj
New Delhi – 70

7. Mr. Devesh Singh
 DANICS
 s/o Mr. Harish Chandra Lal
 47/1/5, Delhi Govt. Officers Flats
 Rajpur Road, Delhi - 54

..Respondents

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice Permod Kohli:

We have heard learned counsel for review applicant (Union of India).

This R.A. is directed against the judgment dated 21.02.2017 passed in O.A. No.3122/2015. The R.A. is filed on 04.08.2017, i.e., after a period of almost 6 months. The grounds in the condonation Application filed with this R.A. are not satisfactory. Otherwise also, the review jurisdiction can only be exercised if one of the conditions under Rule XLVII, Rule 1 of Code of Civil Procedure is satisfied. Existence of an error apparent on the face of record is *sine qua non* for entertaining the review. The other ground is for discovery of new facts and lastly for other sufficient reasons. Neither there has been any error apparent on the face of record, nor is the review based on discovery of new facts, which were not in the knowledge of the review applicant (Union of India) despite due diligence. There is also no other sufficient cause for invoking the review jurisdiction.

2. This R.A. is dismissed being barred by limitation and also on merits.

(K.N. Shrivastava)
Member (A)

(Justice Permod Kohli)
Chairman

September 26, 2017
 /sunil/