

17

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

RA NO.133/91 IN
OA-2034/89

DATE OF ORDER: 3.9.1991

SHRI B.S. ROHILLA

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MR. AMITAV BANERJI, CHAIRMAN

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

FOR THE APPLICANT

SHRI G.D. BHANDARI, COUNSEL


O R D E R


Review Application No.133/91 has been filed by the applicant on 2.8.1991, seeking review of our judgement dated 3.5.1991 in OA-2034/89. The applicant has also filed MP-2264/91, seeking condonation of delay on the ground that the judgement order pronounced on 3.5.1991 was received by him only on 27.5.1991 on his return from Pathankot where he had gone to stay with his son. Another reason given for delay is that Court was closed for summer vacation from 8.6.1991 to 30.6.1991 and even if the applicant had been in Delhi he could not have filed the R.A. In other words, the period of vacation will correspondingly extend the period of limitation.

We have considered the matter carefully. The scope of the review lies within a very narrow compass. "A review of a judgement is a serious step and 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 eneffectually covered ground or minor mistakes of inconsequential import, are obviously insufficient." We do not find in the R.A. either

2

any new and important matter or evidence which after exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the applicant, nor any error apparent on the face of the record, warranting review of the judgement. The repetition of the arguments which have already been adjudicated upon does not provide sufficient cause for seeking the review. Accordingly, the R.A. is dismissed.


(I.K. RASGOTRA)
MEMBER(A) 3/9/91

 3.9.91
(AMITAV BANERJI)
CHAIRMAN