



WEB COPY



Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.01.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

1.Union of India,
Rep. by Secretary,
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting,
A-Wing, Shastri Bhavan,
New Delhi – 110 001.

2.The Director General,
Doordarshan, Doordarshan Bhavan,
Copernicus Marg,
New Delhi – 110 001.

3.The Deputy Director General (F),
Doordarshan Kendra,
Chepauk, Chennai – 600 005.

4.Pay & Accounts Officer,
Doordarshan Kendra,
Chepauk, Chennai – 600 005.

..Review Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Registrar,
Central Administrative Tribunal,
Chennai – 600 104.

2.S.Parthasarathy

..Respondents



Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

Prayer: Review Application filed under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure to review the order dated 09.03.2020 in so far as W.P.No.14032 of 2019.

For Review Petitioners : Mr.Rajesh Vivekananthan,
Deputy Solicitor General of India

For Respondents : Mr.D.Muthukumar,
for M/s.Paul & Paul for R2

R1 - Tribunal

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **R.SUBRAMANIAN,J.**)

The review is sought for solely on the ground that a subsequent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***High Court of Punjab and Haryana Vs. Jagdeve Singh*** reported in (2016) 14 SCC 267 was not considered by the Division Bench.

2. We do not think we can entertain such a ground in a review petition. The facts in ***High Court of Punjab and Haryana Vs. Jagdeve Singh supra*** are completely different, in as much as an undertaking was



Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

made by the employee to re-pay the monetary benefits that has been received by him prior to his retirement. That is not a case here. The Division Bench has specifically noted that no such undertaking was produced. Now, in this review petition the petitioner wants to produce an undertaking which is allegedly given by the employee on 15.09.2008 itself.

3. We do not think we can entertain such belated production of the document particularly in a review. Hence, we do not see any error on the face of the record in the orders of the Division Bench and we **reject** the review petition and the petitioners are required to comply with the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal within a period of eight (8) weeks from today.

(R.S.M., J.) (K.R., J.)
09.01.2024

dsa

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
Speaking order / Non-Speaking order



WEB COPY



Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.
and
KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

dsa

Review Appln. (Writ) No.272 of 2022

09.01.2024