

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH**  
**JABALPUR**

**REVIEW APPLICATION NO.200/00006/2018**  
**(in OA No.368 of 2002)**

Jabalpur, this Thursday, the 15<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2018

**HON'BLE SHRI NAVIN TANDON, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**  
**HON'BLE SHRI RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Smt. Sumitra Bai W/o late Ram Kumar,  
R/o 2281, Shanti Nagar,  
Behind Food Corporation of India,  
Rampur, Jabalpur (M.P.)-482001

**(By Advocate Shri H.R.Bharti)**

**-Applicant**

**V e r s u s**

1. The Union of India, Through the Secretary,  
Department of Defence (Production) New Delhi-110 001
2. The General Manager, Ordnance Factory Khamaria,  
Jabalpur (M.P.)-482005
3. The Ordnance Factory Board, Kolkatta-700001 - **Respondents**

**O R D E R**

**By Navin Tandon, AM-**

This Review Application has been filed by the applicant to review the order dated 15.06.2004 passed by this Tribunal in Original Application No.368 of 2002 (Ram Kumar Vs. The Union of India and others).

**2.** From perusal of the order under review it is found that the aforementioned OA 368/2002, filed by the applicant's husband was

dismissed vide order dated 15.06.2004 after considering the pleadings available on the record of said Original Application. In the present Review Application the applicant has contended that due to non-payment of fees to the counsel, at the time of final hearing, the counsel did not appear in the said matter, therefore, the appropriate facts and rulings regarding unauthorized absence could not be placed before the Tribunal.

**3.** The applicant has also filed MA No.200/00208/2018 wherein she has contended that after the death of her husband she did not challenge the order dated 15.06.2004 but being a widow she had filed a fresh O.A No.766/2011 and later on WP No.13559/2016 but the same had been rejected. On perusal of the record of the present RA, we find that in support of this contention, the applicant has not filed copies of the orders passed in those OA & WP. She simply submits that without quashing the order of removal the applicant will not get any relief and, therefore, the delay should be condoned.

**4.** Heard the learned counsel of applicant and carefully perused the pleadings raised in the Review Application as well as in the Original Application.

5. We also find that while dismissing OA No.368/2002 the Tribunal had passed a detailed & reasoned order after meeting out all the contentions raised by the applicant's husband in his OA.

6. We further find that there is an unexplained delay of more than 13 years in approaching this Tribunal to review the order dated 15.06.2004 passed in OA No.368/2002. Rule 17(1) of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 clearly provides that no application for review shall be entertained unless it is filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of copy of the order sought to be reviewed.

7. In this view of the matter, this Review Application is dismissed, as time barred.

**(Ramesh Singh Thakur)**  
**Judicial Member**

**(Navin Tandon)**  
**Administrative Member**

*rkv*