

①

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**RA No.50/2006 IN
OA No.2560/2003
MA No.510/2006**

New Delhi this 23rd day of March, 2006.

HON'BLE MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Dr. S.B. Lal,
Retd. Principal Scientist,
J-1072, Palam Vihar,
Gurgaon, Haryana.

.....Applicant

-Versus-

1. Indian Council of Agricultural Research (I.C.A.R.)
Through its Secretary, Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi-110001.
2. Govt. of Uttar Pradesh,
Through its Secretary, Deptt. of Agriculture,
U.P. Sachiv, Lucknow,
Uttar Pradesh.
3. Chandershekar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology,
Through its Vice Chancellor, Kanpur,
Uttar Pradesh.
4. Union of India,
Through Secretary, Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances
& Pension,
Department of Administrative Reforms & Public Grievances,
Sardar Patel Bhawan,
Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
5. Accountant General of U.P.
Allahabad U.P.

.....Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J) :

This RA filed by respondents is directed against an order
passed in OA No.2560/2003 on 28.11.2005

2. The review applicants have also filed MA-510/2006 for
condonation of delay in filing the R.A. I have perused the MA for

W

condonation of delay and for the reasons stated in MA 510/2006 seeking condonation of delay in filing the Review Application, MA 510/2006 is allowed.

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

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

S. Raju

(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

/ravi/

J