

(15)

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA NO. 107/91  
IN OA No. 675/89

11.7.1991.

SHRI K.L. MEHTA & ORS.                      APPLICANTS

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS                      RESPONDENTS

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MR. AMITAV BANERJI, CHAIRMAN

THE HON'BLE MR. I.K. RASGOTRA, MEMBER (A)

FOR THE APPLICANTS                      SHRI J.P. VERGHESE, COUNSEL

The Review Petition No. 107/1991 has been filed seeking review of the judgement delivered on 6.3.1991 in OA No. 675/89. The prayer made in the petition is that the cause of action has in fact arisen on 1.7.1986 on which date the impugned circular No. 27/9/86-Estt was issued by the respondents and that immediately thereafter the petitioner had made a representation which was answered by the respondents on 13.10.1987. Thereafter the matter was referred to the Department of Personnel and Training and that Department's opinion was available on 6.4.1988 accepting the claim of the petitioner. The points made in the Review Petition had been considered by us and it is not that any of these facts had been ignored. The judgement of the Tribunal was delivered after carefully considering the material brought before us.

In the case of **Chandra Kanta and another V. Sheikh Habib** - AIR 1975 S.C. 1500 the Hon'ble 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."


*al*

(34)

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 of the old and over ruled argument a second trip over ineffectually covered ground or minor mistakes of inconsequential import, are obviously insufficient."

In view of the above observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and for the reason that no new fact or patent error on the face of record has been brought out, we do not consider that adequate grounds exist for review of the judgement. The Review Application is accordingly rejected.

  
(I.K. Rasgotra)  
Member (A) 11/7/1991

  
(Amitav Banerji)  
Chairman