

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

NEW DELHI

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

R.A.No. 142/95
in
O.A.No. 2519/93.

Date of decision: 19-7-95

Shri H.R. Sharma,
r/o 34/D, M.E.S.,
Officers' Enclave,
Kotwali Road,
Delhi Cantt - 110 010.

versus:

1. Union of India, through
Secretary, Ministry of
Defence, New Delhi-110 011.
2. Engineer-in-Chief,
Kashmir House, DHQ PO.,
New Delhi-110 011.
3. Chief Engineer,
Western Command,
Gandhi Manir.
4. Director General, Naval Project,
Visakhapatnam,
Andhra Pradesh.
5. Chief Engineer, Delhi Zone,
Delhi Cantt.

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

This is a Review Application bearing No. 142/95
in O.A. No. 2519/93 filed by the applicant praying for
review of the judgment order dated 17th April, 1995.

2. I have carefully perused the contents of the
Review Application. The applicant, after referring to
the provisions of O. 47, Rule 1 CPC under which a review
application can be filed, has tried to show in the
review application that there is a mistake or error
apparent on the face of the record and there are suffi-
cient reasons and other grounds on which the review

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

<https://PDFReplacer.com>

23

This document is processed by PDF Replacer Free version. If you want to remove this text, please upgrade to PDF Replacer Pro.
<https://PDFReplacer.com>

application should succeed. The judgment in original application was delivered on 17.4.1995 ~~and~~ after hearing both the learned counsel and perusing the record and giving reasons for dismissing the application.

A perusal of the review application will show that what the applicant is trying to do in this case in the garb of ^{the} review application is to seek ^{an} appeal against the judgment. It is settled law that the instrumentality of the review application cannot be used for this purpose, merely because the applicant feels that the decision/judgment is wrong. No error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed out and review application cannot be the remedy for seeking relief in the circumstances mentioned therein. It is also seen that no new ground has been raised in the review application which could not have been raised at the time when the applicant was heard in support of the original application.

3. In the light of what has been stated above, the Review Application is rejected.

Lakshmi Srinivasan
(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (Judicial)