

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.302/2003 in
O.A.No.849/2003
MA No.2160/2003

(1)

New Delhi, this the 21st day of October, 2003

HON'BLE SHRI SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Shri S.P. Kulshrestha

-Applicant

Versus

Union of India & Others

-Respondents

O R D E R (BY CIRCULATION)

The present RA is filed by the review applicant, seeking review of my order dated 18.09.2003 passed in OA No.849/2003.

2. The main contention put-forth is that respondents No.3 and 4 had not been served. Applicant in the memo of parties in OA sought service of respondents No.3 and 4 through respondent No.2. From the office report on service it transpires that the service sent to respondents No.3 and 4 through respondent No.2, i.e., Plant Protection Adviser has been effected with the acknowledgement returned back served. Accordingly, the ground of review applicant fails. Despite opportunity and service respondents No.3 and 4 have not contested the OA.

3. I have also perused my order dated 18.09.2003 and also the review application 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. If the review applicant is not satisfied with the order passed by the Tribunal remedy lies elsewhere. By way of this RA he seeks to re-argue the case, which is not permissible in terms of the provisions of Section 22 (3)

Q

(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with Order XLVII, 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. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed, in circulation.

4

S. Raju
(Shanker Raju)
Member (J)

'San.'