

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

Review Application No.256 of 1997
(in O.A. No.12 of 1997)

New Delhi, this the 14th day of August, 1998

R.K.Seewal, Ex-Workshop Supdt,
Directorate of Technical Education,
NCT, Delhi Presently Senior Regional
Manager, Food Corporation of India,
Delhi Region, 17-Parbhat Kiran
Building, Rajendra Place, New
Delhi-110008.

-APPLICANT

Versus

1. Lt. Governor, Govt. of NCT, Delhi.
2. Chief Secretary, Govt. of NCTD.
3. Secretary/Director, Technical Education, Govt. of NCTD.
4. Principal, Pusa Polytechnic, Pusa, New Delhi-110012

-RESPONDENTS


O R D E R (in circulation)

This review application was filed on 16.10.1997 seeking a review of the order dated 28.8.1997 passed in O.A.No.12 of 1997, copy of which was received by the applicant on 17.9.1997.

2. I have carefully considered the submissions made in the R.A. and consulted the record. I find that there is no mistake apparent on the face of record and the claims made out are merely arguments on merits which do not entitle the applicant for a review. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of K.Ajit Babu and others Vs. Union of India and others, JT 1997(7) SC 24 has held that "the right of review is not a right of appeal where all questions decided are open to challenge. The right of review is possible only on limited grounds mentioned in Order 47 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Otherwise

12

there being no limitation on the power of review it would be an appeal and there would be no certainty of finality of a decision". This review application amounts to only rearguing what has been stated in the O.A. In the case of Meera Bhanja (Smt.) Vs. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury(Smt.), (1995)1SCC 170 their Lordships have held that the review must be confined to error apparent on the face of record and the error apparent on the face of record must be such an error which must strike one on mere looking at the record and would not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on points where there may conceivably be two opinions. Therefore, this review application is not maintainable and is dismissed at the circulation stage itself.


(N. Sahu)
Member (Admnv)

rkv.