

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO. 22406 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2763 OF 2015

Padmakar S Patkar. ... Petitioner.
V/s.
Central Administrative Tribunal and another. ... Respondents.

Mr.Padmakar Patkar, petitioner in person.

CORAM : A.S.OKA AND M.S.SONAK, JJ.

DATE : 16th October 2018.

P.C.:

The first submission made by the petitioner appearing in person is that the judgment mentioned in paragraph-12 of the writ petition was relied upon by him at the time of hearing but the same was not considered. His second submission is that the judgment sought to be reviewed shows non-application of mind. His third submission is that the petition filed by him is in the nature of public interest litigation to show how our quasi judicial authorities are functioning.

2. As far as last submission is concerned, there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner filed the writ petition as a public interest litigation. The only substantive prayers are for setting aside the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal and for setting aside the order passed by the disciplinary authority against the petitioner. As far as

second last submission is concerned, there is nothing to show non-application of mind by the Division Bench. This is not a ground for review. As far as first submission is concerned, in the review petition, averments made on oath does not show that a specific case is made out that the decision relied upon in paragraph-12 was cited at the time of hearing and was not considered. Now, the petitioner states that he wants to add that ground. It is too late to add that ground. There is no error apparent on the face of record. Even otherwise, there is no ground for review. The review petition is rejected.

(M.S.SONAK, J.)

(A.S.OKA, J.)