

20

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,  
NEW DELHI.

R.A.No.11 of 1996.  
IN

O.A.No.2093 of 1994.

New Delhi: this the 12th Feb, 96

Sh. S.C.Lal,  
S/o Shri Ram Chander Lal Srivastav,  
aged 42 years, r/CA-3, Railway Health Unit  
Complex, Anand Vihar,  
Delhi-92, working as Electric Chargeman under  
Senior Electrical Engineer, Construction I,  
Divisional Railway Manager's Office, State  
Entry Road, New Delhi  
.....Applicant.

Versus

Union of India through  
1. General Manager,

Northern Railway,  
Baroda House,  
New Delhi.

2. Divisional Railway Manager,  
Delhi Division, Northern Railway,  
State Entry Road,  
New Delhi

3. Shri Daulat Ram,  
S/o Shri Kewal Singh (SC),  
Sr. Electrical Chargeman,  
DRM Office, Northern Railway,  
New Delhi

....Respondents.

ORDER (By Circulation)

By Hon'ble Mr. S.R.Adige, Member (A).

We have perused the R.A. In the background of Section 22(3)(f) A.T. Act any decision/judgment/order of the Tribunal can be reviewed only if it falls within the four corners of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. The contents of the RA make it abundantly clear that none of the grounds contained therein bring it within the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In fact in the guise of a review petition, what the applicant is seeking, is a review of the impugned judgment dated 29.11.95 which is clearly impermissible in view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment in

(21)

A.T.Sharma Vs. A.P.Sharma- AIR 1979 SC 1047 where in  
it has been held:

"The power of review may be exercised on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking the review or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made; it may be exercised where some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found; it may also be exercised on any analogous ground. But, it may not be exercised on the ground that the decision was erroneous on merits. That would be the province of a court of appeal. A power of review is not to be confused with appellate power which may enable an Appellate Court to correct all manner of errors committed by the Subordinate Court."

2. The RA is therefore rejected.

*A. Vedavalli*  
12/2/96  
( DR. A. VEDA VALLI )  
MEMBER (J)

*Adige*  
( S.R. ADIGE )  
MEMBER (A).

/ug/