

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

**R.A No. 131/2015
O.A No. 2844/2010
M.A No. 1673/2015**

New Delhi, this the 11th day of July, 2017

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

R. D. Kashyap,
Retd. Dy. Registrar of Companies,
Aged about 66 years,
S/o. Sh. M. R. Kashyap,
R/o. G-27/1 B, Street No. 2,
Shakarpur, Delhi -110 092.

...Review Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. M. K. Bhardwaj)

Versus

Union of India & Ors., through :

1. Union of India,
The Secretary,
Ministry of Corporate Affairs,
A Wing, 5th Floor,
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Director (Admn.)
Ministry of Corporate Affairs,
Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi.

.....Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. H, K. Gangwani)

O R D E R (O R A L)

Justice Permod Kohli, Chairman

M.A No. 1673/2015 :

This application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of more than four years. Admittedly, the judgment

sought to be reviewed came to be passed on 13.09.2010 in O.A No. 2844/2010. The Review Petition has been filed on 16.04.2015.

2. The grounds seeking condonation of delay in filing the review are vaguely reflected in the M.A. In para 3 it is stated that when the O.A was dismissed the applicant was not in Delhi. He sought information from his counsel in 2012 and came to know in September, 2012 about the dismissal of the O.A. The applicant got NFU grade on 3rd July, 2014. It is stated that he again approached the respondents for reconsideration of his case for grant of JAG from due date. However, no reference is made to any written representation or application. It is further stated that the applicant approached one Sh. Krishna Kumar, Advocate to prepare the fresh O.A. However, he was advised to file Review Application. The Review Application was allegedly drafted in March 2015 and filed on 16.04.2015.

3. From a perusal of the condonation application, we find that the delay has not been explained satisfactorily. The averments are so vague that no cognizance of such averments can be taken, particularly when the delay is for a period of more than four years. There is no sufficient

cause for condoning the delay. The condonation application is accordingly dismissed being without any merit.

R.A No. 131/2015 :

We have carefully perused the grounds of the Review application. The Review application is as vague as the condonation application. It is settled law that the jurisdiction to intervene in review jurisdiction is permissible within the parameters prescribed in Order 47 Rule 1 of the CPC read with Rule 17 of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987. No error apparent on the face of record has been shown in the review application. There is no other valid ground or discovery of documents which were not within the knowledge of the applicant at the time when the O.A was dismissed. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely no valid ground to entertain the review. Review petition is dismissed accordingly.

(K. N. Shrivastava)
Member (A)

(Justice Permod Kohli)
Chairman

/Mbt/