



3. In this connectin, it may be mentioned that the OA was dimissed on merit for the detailed reasons mentioned therein following the law laid down by the apex court in the cases of State of Rajasthan Vs. B.K. Meena & Ors. JT 1996(8) SC 864 as well as Capt. Paul Anthony V. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd., & Anr. JT 1999(2) SC 456, which are binding on us. Therefore the instructions relied upon by the review applicant as referred to in para 2 above do not render any help to him. Therefore, the RA is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed.

4. That apart, it would be pertinent to reiterate here that the scope of review is very limited. The Tribunal under Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 read with the provisions of Order 47, Rule 1 of CPC exercises the power of review if there is (1) discovery of a new and important piece of evidence, which inspite of due diligence was not available with the review applicant at the time of hearing or when the order was made; (2) an error apparent on the face of the record or (3) any other analogous ground. Since none of these ingredients is available in the present RA, the same deserves to be dismissed. We do so accordingly.

  
(S.P. Biswas)  
Member (A)

  
(V. Rajagopala Reddy)  
Vice-Chairman (J)