

(1)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.148/2004  
IN  
MA No.1208/2004  
OA No.2120/2003

This the 4<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2004

HON'BLE SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)  
HON'BLE SHRI S.K. NAIK, MEMBER (A)

B.M.L. Bhardwaj,  
73/2, Gobind Park,  
Delhi-110051.

-Applicant

-Versus-

Union of India through the  
Director General (Works) &  
Ex-Officio Secretary,  
Central Public Works Department,  
New Delhi-110011.

-Respondent

O R D E R (BY CIRCULATION)

SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J) :

The present R.A. is filed by the review applicant seeking review of our order dated 13.11.2003 passed in OA No.2120/2003. We have perused the order dated 13.11.2003 and do not find any error apparent on the face of the record or discovery of new material which was not available with the review applicant, despite due diligence, at the time of final hearing.

2. Review applicant has also filed MA-1208/2004 for condonation of delay in filing the RA. We have perused the grounds taken in the MA and do not find any sufficient ground to condone the delay. MA is, therefore, rejected.

3. However, in the interest of justice, we have also perused the R.A. and found that by way of this R.A.

(2)

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 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.

Naik  
(S.K. Naik)

Member (A)

S. Raju  
(Shanker Raju)  
Member (J)

'San.'