

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

HON. SHRI R.K. AHOOJA, MEMBER 'A'

RA NO. 69/1997 IN OA NO. 760/96

(a)

NEW DELHI, THIS 11<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MARCH 1997

SHRI MANGAL SINGH  
S/o Lt. Shri Budhan Ram  
House No.264/1 Gali No.12  
Than Singh Nagar  
NEW DELHI

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. UNION OF INDIA, through  
Secretary  
Ministry of Urban Development  
Nirman Bhawan  
NEW DELHI
2. DIRECTOR GENERAL OF WORKS  
Central Public Works Department  
Government of India  
Nirman Bhawan  
NEW DELHI
3. PROJECT MANAGER 'C.E.'  
P.W.D.  
M.S.O. Building  
T.P. Estate  
NEW DELHI

ORDER 'BY CIRCULATION'

In O.A. No.760/1996, the applicant had sought certain reliefs regarding his pay fixation and pension thereafter on the basis of his officiation in the post of Finance Officer 'F.O.' with the respondents. It was held by the impugned order that since the case of the applicant did not fulfill the requirements of FR 49, <sup>rule 3(1)</sup>, the respondents could not be said to have acted wrongly in rejecting the belated representation. The present R.A. has been filed

on the ground that the conclusion of the Tribunal is erroneous on the face of record.' In the R.A., the grounds adduced in the O.A. have been reiterated and it has been argued that since the review petitioner had performed additional duties and taken on higher responsibility and because written orders had been issued, he came within the ambit of FR 49, sub-rule 3(i) and was entitled to the relief sought for. A reference has also been made to a judgement of the Supreme Court reported in JT 1996 Vol.9 p.458, JUDHISTER MOHANTY VS. STATE OF ORISSA.

2. I have considered the matter carefully. What the review petitioner wants is to go over the same grounds as agitated in the O.A. The conclusion reached by the Tribunal may well be wrong in the eyes of the applicant but his remedy for that does not lie in a review petition but through an appeal in the appropriate forum. There is no error on the face of record which has been pointed out. A review can be considered only where a glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility. A mere repetition of old and overruled arguments, a second trip over ineffectually covered ground or minor mistake of inconsequential import are obviously insufficient.

'CHANDRA KANTA & ANR. VS. SHEIK HABIB, AIR 1975 SC 500'.

3. As no ~~new~~ ground for considering a review has been made out, this R.A. is dismissed. No costs.

*R.K. Ahuja*  
'R.K. AHOOJA'  
MEMBER 'A'