

(1)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**RA No.24/2005 IN
OA No.1987/2003
MA No.245/2005**

New Delhi this the 9th day of February, 2005

**HON'BLE MR. V.K. MAJOTRA, VICE CHAIRMAN (A)
HON'BLE MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)**

Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Others	-Review Applicants
-Versus-	
Masood Ahmed and others	-Review Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J) :

This RA is directed against an order passed in OA No.1987/2003 on 7.10.2004 allowing the OA partly by setting aside the impugned order dated 29.7.2002 and further directions were issued to the original respondents to constitute a Committee consisting of representatives(s) from the Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ministry of Finance and examine the question of parity of pay scale to the original applicants including revision of the pay scales and pass a final order within a period of four months from the date of passing of that order.

2. The review applicants have also filed MA-245/2005 for condonation of delay in filing the R.A. We have perused the MA for condonation of delay and for the reasons stated in MA 245/2005 seeking condonation of delay in filing the Review Application, MA 245/2005 is allowed.

3. We have also perused the grounds taken in the Review Application, but we find no error apparent on the face of record. By

h

this Review Application, applicants in Review Application are only trying to re-argue the whole matter as if it is an appeal. The ambit of review under Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 as well as Order XLVII , Rules (1) and (2) is limited. The Apex Court in *Union of India v. Tarit Ranjan Das*, 2004 SCC (L&S) 160 observed as under:

"13. The Tribunal passed the impugned order by reviewing the earlier order. A bare reading of the two orders shows that the order in review application was in complete variation and disregard of the earlier order and the strong as well as sound reasons contained therein whereby the original application was rejected. The scope for review is rather limited and it is not permissible for the forum hearing the review application to act as an appellate authority in respect of the original order by a fresh order and rehearing of the matter to facilitate a change of opinion on merits. The Tribunal seems to have transgressed its jurisdiction in dealing with the review petition as if it was hearing an original application. This aspect has also not been noticed by the High Court."

5. Having regard to the above, RA is dismissed, in circulation.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

/ravi/

V.K. Majotra 9.2.05
(V.K. Majotra) Vice Chairman (A)