

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.22/2004 in OA No.1052/2003

New Delhi, this the 3rd day of February, 2004

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman
Hon'ble Shri S.K. Naik, Member(A)

K.P. Singh and Two others .. Applicants
(Shri O.P.Gehlot, Advocate)

versus

Govt. of NCT of Delhi and others .. Respondents

ORDER(in circulation)
Shri S.K. Naik

This application for review has been filed by the applicants in which it has been claimed that the Tribunal while dismissing the application of the applicants in OA No.1052/2003 has passed the order which suffers from apparent error of facts and law.

2. As per the provisions of Rule 17(2) of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987, an application for review can be entertained within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the order sought to be reviewed. In the case in hand, it is submitted by the applicants that copy of the order was despatched by the Registrar's office on 28.10.2003. Considering that it would have taken a few days to reach, it can be safely held that the limitation of 30 days would commence from 1.11.2003 and the application therefore should have been filed by 30.11.2003. However, it has been filed on 15th December, 2003 for which an application for condonation of delay has been filed. Since a plea of some bereavement in the family of one of the applicants is taken as the main ground, we condone the delay.

Final

(3)

3. On merits of the review petition, we find that the applicants have reiterated the same grounds which have been advanced in the OA. No new facts or additional justification have been indicated which were lost sight off by the Tribunal in arriving at the decision. On the contrary order dated 17.10.2003 is a detailed one, wherein not only the entire facts of the case were discussed but various judicial pronouncements relied upon by both the parties were analysed and distinguished vis-a-vis the merits of the case. We do not find any error apparent on the face of the record as alleged by the review applicants.

4. -- We therefore find the averments now advanced by the applicants do not fall within the four corners of Order 47,--Rule 1 CPC read with Section 22(3)(f) of AT Act, 1985, warranting a review. RA accordingly fails and is dismissed.



(S.K. Naik)
Member(A)



(V.S. Aggarwal)
Chairman

/gtv/