

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH  
NEW DELHI

(A)

RA No. 256 of 1995  
in

DA No. 646 of 1993

New Delhi, this the 10th day of October, 1995.

Shri Sohan Singh Joshi,  
S/O late Shri Bishan Singh Joshi,  
C/O Sh. Sant Lal, Advocate,  
C-21(8) New Multan Nagar,  
Delhi-56.

... . . . Applicant.

vs.

1. The Union of India  
through the Secretary  
Ministry of Communications,  
Department of Posts,  
Dal Bhawan,  
New Delhi-1.

... . .

2. The Chief Postmaster General,  
Delhi Circle,  
Meghdoot Bhawan,  
New Delhi-1.

3. The Chief Postmaster,  
G.P.O, New Delhi,  
New Delhi.

... . . Respondents.

ORDER By Hon'ble Mr B.K. Singh, Member (A)

This Review Application No. 256 of 1995 in  
DA No. 646 of 1993 has been filed against the order  
dated 4th August, 1995. The application was partly  
allowed and the respondents were directed to rectify  
the pay of the applicant at par with his juniors and  
also to give him all other consequential benefits  
minus the arrears of pay since he had drawn the  
deputation allowance. His notional promotion was  
to be from the date he was given proforma promotion  
and he would draw the increments due to him from the  
date he reverted minus the arrears of these

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to **PDF Replacer Pro**.  
increments.

<https://PDFReplacer.com>

The scope of review is very limited and

(A)

107/107

the Tribunal does not have inherent power of review. It exercises the power under Order 47 Rule 1 of the C.P.C. Review of judgments can be allowed on the three grounds, namely;

(b)

a) discovery of new and important material or evidence, which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed;

b) There was some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record which could materially change the complexion of the judgment; and

c) for any other sufficient reason.

After going through the review application, I do not find discovery of any new and important material or evidence, which could not be produced by the applicant at the time when the order was made. There may be some errors in dates etc. which can be corrected but it cannot change the dimensions of the judgment. The errors are only in dates etc. as pointed out by the applicant, it does not have any bearing on the judgment as a whole. The mistake or error on the face of the record should be such as can change the nature of the order. This is not so in the instant case. There is no other sufficient reason warranting the review of the judgment and accordingly, the review application is summarily dismissed under Order 47 Rule 4(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure.