

①

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench

R.A. No. 261/2004

In

O.A. No. 2932/2003

New Delhi, this the 4<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2004

**Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Vice-Chairman (A)**  
**Hon'ble Shri Shanker Raju, Member (J)**

Union of India & Others

...Review applicants

-versus-

Shri Dayanand

...Respondents  
(applicant in the O.A.)

**ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)**

**By Hon'ble Shri V.K. Majotra, Vice Chairman (A)**

Through this application, respondents in the OA have sought review of Tribunal's orders dated 20.08.2004 in OA 2932 of 2003 (Annexure-1). It has been stated in this application that the counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, due to his ignorance, did not place true facts of the case before the Tribunal, as a result of which a mistake apparent on the face of record crept in.

2. Tribunal's orders had been passed taking into consideration the contentions raised on behalf of both sides through their respective counsel. Ignorance of the counsel is no good ground for review of Tribunal's orders passed on merits and on considering the contentions made from both sides. Thus, there is no apparent mistake on the face of record. This application appears to be an attempt at re-arguing the case, which is beyond the scope and ambit of review. This R.A. is, therefore, rejected in circulation.

S. Raju

**(Shanker Raju)**  
Member (J)  
/na/

V.K. Majotra

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