

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

M.C.A.NO. 595/2013 IN W.P.NO. 1139/2013.

Union of India and others.

VERSUS

R.H. Gharsile Harischandra Singh and another.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI
AND P. B. VARALE, JJ.

DATED : JANUARY 30, 2015.

Heard Shri R.G. Agrawal, learned Counsel
for the applicants and Shri C.L. Dehariya, learned
Counsel for respondent no.1. None appears for
respondent no.2. It is not necessary to hear
respondent no.2 in the present matter.

The order passed by the Central
Administrative Tribunal on 22.07.2009, reproduced in
paragraph no.3 of the Review Application/petition is

pressed into service by the learned counsel for the applicants to urge that while passing orders in Writ Petition No.1139/2013 on 08.03.2013, there is a error apparent on the face of record.

Shri Dehariya, learned Counsel strives hard to demonstrate that it is applicants/petitioners who misled the Central Administrative Tribunal. Parties were not described correctly in the review petition and hence, the Central Administrative Tribunal under an impression that the review application/petition was also filed by the present non-applicant (Original petitioner/applicant in Original Application before it), dismissed it for want of prosecution. He therefore, states that there is no merit either in the Writ petition or in Review Petition.

Facts above show that the review petition was not filed by the present non-applicant no.1 and it has been dismissed by the Central Administrative Tribunal on 22.07.2009 under an impression that it was presented by the present non-applicant.

This fact has not been gone into on

08.03.2013 while disposing of the Writ Petition No.1139/2013. As such, we recall the order dated 08.03.2013 and restore Writ Petition No.1139/2013 back to file.

List the Writ Petition for admission in w/c. 09.02.2015.

Shri Dehariya, learned Counsel states that he would be appearing for respondent no.1 in Writ Petition.

Misc. Civil Application is accordingly allowed and disposed of. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rgd