

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA No.166/93 in
O.A No. 23/93

Date of Order :

5.7.93

Shri Hazari Lal & Anr

...Petitioners

Versus

Union of India & Another

...Respondents

CORAM :-

The Hon'ble Mr I.K. Rasgotra, Member(A)
The Hon'ble Mr J.P. Sharma, Member(J)

ORDER

This petitioner has been filed by the petitioners to seek review of our judgement dated 22.4.1993 rendered in OA 23/93. The O.A. was dismissed, as the same was barred by limitation under Section 21 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The petitioners in the R.A. are seeking to reargue the matter on merits. This cannot be allowed. The Supreme Court in the case of **Ratam Chandra Sammanta & Ors. v. the Union of India & Ors. JT 1993 (3) SC 418** has held :-

"A Writ is issued by this Court in favour of a person who has some right. And not for the sake of roving enquiry leaving scope for manoeuvring. Delay itself deprives a person of his remedy available in law. In absence of any fresh cause of action or any legislation a person who has lost his remedy by lapse of time loses his right as well."

In view of the above the highly belated

Further Hon'ble

6 ✓
Supreme Court in the case of **Chandra Kant and**
another v. Sheik Habib AIR 1975 SC 1500 has
held :-

"Once an order has been passed by the Court, a review thereof must be subject to the rules of the game and cannot be lightly entertained. A review of a judgement is a serious step and a resort to it is proper only where a glaring omission or patent mistake or grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility. A mere repetition through a different counsel, of the old and overruled arguments, a second trip over ineffectually covered ground or minor mistakes of inconsequential import, are obviously insufficient."

In the above circumstances the R.A. is rejected in circulation.

Jomane
(J.P. SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)

5-7-93

I.K. Rasgotra
(I.K. RASGOTRA)
MEMBER (A)

San.