

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

**RA-146/2018 in OA-2634/2018
with
RA-147/2018 in OA-2633/2018**

New Delhi this the 29th day of August, 2018.

Hon'ble Ms. Praveen Mahajan, Member (A)

Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)

RA-146/2018 in OA-2634/2018

1. Cheta S/o Late Sh. Sohan
2. Duli Chand S/o Sh. Cheta
Both R/o Dhani Rahgira, PO Bhagega,
Teh. NeemKa Thana, Dist. Sikar,
Rajasthan. ... Review Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through the Chairman, Railway Board,
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, NWR,
Malviya Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
North Western Railway,
Near Agrasen Circle, Bikaner, Rajasthan. Respondents

RA-147/2018 in OA-2633/2018

1. Maru S/o Late Sh. Bhagwana
2. Kishori Lal Gurjar,
S/o Sh. Maru Ram Gurjar
Both R/o Rani Palwali, Vill. PO Bhagega,

Teh. Neem Ka Thana, Dist. Sikar,
Rajasthan.

.... Review Applicants

Versus

1. Union of India through the Chairman, Railway Board,
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, NWR,
Malviya Nagar, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager,
North Western Railway,
Near Agrasen Circle, Bikaner,
Rajasthan.

.... Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

Ms. Praveen Mahajan, Member (A)

RA-146/2018 in OA-2634/2018 and RA-147/2018 in OA-2633/2018 have been filed against the Tribunal's order dated 17.07.2018 vide which OA-3977/2017 with OA-2633/2018 and OA-2634/2018 were dismissed.

2. The review applicants in these two RAs have stated that on 17.07.2018 in OA-2633/2018 and 2634/2018, the following order was passed by the Tribunal:-

"Heard the learned counsel for the applicants.

OA is disposed of. Separate order will follow."

3. After perusing the review applications, it is clarified that the above order quoted by the review applicants has been wrongly sent on cat website whereas vide order dated 17.07.2018 these were dismissed in limine being devoid of merit. However, even otherwise this will not make any difference in the decision of the Tribunal.

4. Existence of error apparent on the face of record is *sine qua non* for entertainment of the review application.

5. We have perused the judgment under review as also the grounds of review. We do not find any error apparent on the face of record warranting interference in exercise of the review jurisdiction.

6. Review Applications are accordingly dismissed in circulation.

(S.N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Praveen Mahajan)
Member (A)

/vinita/