

(1)

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

R.A. No. 304 of 2004

in

O.A. No. 2893 of 2003

M.A. No. 2322 of 2004

New Delhi this the 1st day of December, 2004

Hon'ble Shri Sarweshwar Jha, Member (A)

Union of India & Ors.

..... Review applicants.

Versus

Vishwanath & Ors.


..... Respondents.

ORDER (By Circulation)

The respondents in OA No. 2893/2003 (applicants herein) have filed this Review Application for review of the order dated 12.08.2004 passed in O.A.2893/2003. They have also filed MA for staying the operation of the aforesaid order.

2. I have carefully considered the grounds taken in this Review Application and find that the applicants are only trying to reargue the case as if it is an appeal. The order in the O.A. had been passed after hearing the learned counsel for the parties. A review application, it must be remembered, has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be 'an appeal in disguise'. If the applicants are not satisfied with the order of the Tribunal, they can pursue their remedies in accordance with law, but it is not permitted in a Review Application.

3. As the applicants have not made out their case to review the order in OA dated 12.8.2004, in exercise of the powers under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC read with Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, RA 304/2004 is rejected. Accordingly, MA No.2322/2004 also stands rejected.


(Sarweshwar Jha)
Member(A)