

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

R.A. 1/93 in
O.A. 366/86

Date of decision :05.2.1993

Smt Jamuna

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through
President's Secretariat
Rashtrapati Bhavan,
NEW DELHI

... Respondents

CORAM :-

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.S. MALIMATH, CHAIRMAN
THE HON'BLE MR I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER (A)

ORDER

The Review Application has been filed seeking review of our judgement in O.A. 386/86 which was rendered on 9.11.1992. None had appeared for the petitioner nor for the respondents. We had, therefore, gone through the record before us carefully and decided the O.A. on merits. By way of Review Application, the petitioner is now seeking to reagitate the matter on the grounds already adduced in the main O.A.

In Chandra Kanta & Another V/s Sheik Habib


- AIR 1975 S.C.1500 Supreme Court has held that :-


" 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.

32

A mere repetition through a different counsel, of the old and overruled arguments, a second trip over ineffectively covered ground or minor mistakes of inconsequential import, are obviously insufficient."

2. In view of the above observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is not possible for us to cover the matter once again merely because the counsel for the petitioner was not present on the day the case was decided on merits. The grounds of review do not come within the statutory provisions made under Order XLVII C.P.C. We do not find any merit in the R.A. and the same is accordingly rejected.


(I.K. RASGOTRA)
MEMBER (A)


(V.S. MALIMATH)
CHAIRMAN