

(A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.105/2004 ✓
MA No.868/2004
OA No.1813/2003

New Delhi, this the 28th day of April 2004

HON'BLE SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Shri Surjeet Kumar ... Review applicant

-Versus-

Union of India & Others: ... Respondents

O R D E R (BY CIRCULATION)

By Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)

The present R.A. is filed by the applicant, seeking review of my order dated 06.01.2004 passed in OA-1813/2003. I have perused the order dated 06.01.2004 and I do not find any error apparent on the face of the record or discovery of new material which was not available with the applicant, despite due diligence, at the time of final hearing.

2. The review applicant has also filed MA-868/2004 for condonation of delay. I have perused the MA and is satisfied that the grounds taken are not good enough to condone the delay. Accordingly, the MA is rejected.

3. However, in the interest of justice, I have also perused the R.A. and found that by way of this R.A., the review applicant seeks to re-argue the case, which is not permissible. The present R.A. is not maintainable as per provisions of Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Order 47, Rule (1) of CPC

(2)

(2)

and also in view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in K. Ajit Babu & Others v. Union of India & Others, JT 1997 (7) SC 24 as well as Lily Thomas v. Union of India, (2000) 6 SCC 224. If the review applicant is not satisfied with the orders passed the remedy lies elsewhere. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed, in circulation.

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

'San.'