

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**  
**PATNA BENCH, PATNA**  
**RA/050/00032/19**  
**[Arising out of OA/050/00631/18]**

Date of Order: 29.05.2019

**C O R A M**  
**HON'BLE MR. DINESH SHARMA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

Chinta Devi and Anr.	.....	Applicants
- Vrs.-		
Union of India & Ors.,	.....	Respondents

**O R D E R**  
**[By Circulation]**

**Dinesh Sharma, A.M:-** The instant Review Application has been filed seeking review of this Tribunal's order dated 25.04.2019 passed in OA/050/00631/2018 by which the OA was dismissed by a detailed order.

2. Following grounds have been taken for review of order under review: -

(i) The judgment has misquoted that applicant have produced letter dated 09.06.2009 of DM, Patna. Actually, a letter dated 16.06.2009 issued by appropriate civil authority was sent to the respondent no. 2.

(ii) That the Tribunal has found that the applicant has apparently refused to cooperate with the conduct of the enquiry. This is incorrect. The applicant did raise objection about the propriety of DNA test by Vidhi Vigyan Prayogsala, Bihar since it was not supposed to conduct DNA test and since the blood sample has to be forwarded to the Prayogsala by a Judicial Magistrate which cannot be done in this case.

(iii) & (iv). The Tribunal omitted to take account of the fact that respondent no. 5 obtained an enquiry report by deputing one of his Welfare Inspectors which was unwarranted. He has also alleged that the inquiry report submitted by the Welfare Inspector is a fake document.

3. After examining the records, it is clear that none of the grounds taken above are sufficient to warrant a review in this matter. The first ground is incorrect since the Tribunal's order did not mention to whom the letter dated 16.06.2009 was addressed to. There is no error in the date of letter under reference. In any case, even if there is any error in the reporting of facts in the Tribunal's order, it is insignificant. The other grounds mentioned above have been dealt with in the order under review and if the applicant differs with the findings of this Tribunal the correct course of action would be to challenge it before a higher judicial forum and not by a review which is intended to correct only the errors apparent on the face of record. The RA is, therefore, dismissed under circulation.

**[ Dinesh Sharma ]**  
**Administrative Member**

**Srk.**