

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A.No.238/2000 in
O.A.No.2646/99

22

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.Rajagopala Reddy, VC(J)
Hon'ble Smt. Shanta Shastri, Member(A)

New Delhi, this the 7th day of August, 2000

Shri V.S.Tyagi ... Applicant

Vs.

Union of India & Others. ... Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

By Justice Rajagopala Reddy:

The applicant filed the OA impugning the order by which he was issued a charge sheet alleging that he was guilty of the charge of unauthorised absence. Having heard the counsel for the applicant and the respondents, the OA was finally decided, with the consent of the parties and it was dismissed.

2. The present RA was filed taking several grounds and stating that the order be recalled on the ground that the view taken by the Tribunal was wrong. We do not however find any patent mistake apparent on the face of the record. The applicant seeks to reargue the case in the garb of the review. It is well settled position that the power of review is not to be confused with the appellate power which might enable an appellate court to correct any manner of errors committed by the Court. Review of Judgment is a serious step and resort to it would be proper only where a clear error or patent mistake or grave error had crept into the order by judicial fallibility.

Contd - 2



- 2 -

Minor mistakes of inconsequence ~~are~~^{of} import are insufficient. As we find no patent error, the RA is dismissed by circulation. No costs.

23

Shanta Shastri
(SMT. SHANTA SHASTRI)
MEMBER(A)

V. Rajagopala Reddy
(V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY)
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/RAO/