

34

In the Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench: New Delhi

RA No.313/92 in
OA No.918/90

Date of Order: 17.11.1992.

S.C. Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India through the
Secretary, Ministry of
Information and Broadcasting
& Others

...Respondents

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (J)
The Hon'ble Mr. I.K. Rasgotra, Member (A)

O R D E R

In this Review Application the review petitioner
prays for review of our judgement rendered in OA-918
of 1990 on 5.6.1992. The Review Application has
been filed on 1.10.1992 while according to the
petitioner's own showing the Registry had forwarded
the copy of the judgement to the counsel of the
petitioner on 25.6.1992 which was received by him
on 30.6.1992. The Review Application is, therefore,
clearly time barred in terms of Rule 17 (2) of Central
Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987,
as amended from time to time; besides there is no
application for condonation of delay. On the other
hand, the petitioner has tried to justify the delay
by passing on the burden to the postal authorities
etc.

2. Besides the above, the grounds adduced in the petition have been the subject matter of the Original Application itself. The review jurisdiction of the Court lies in a very narrow compass. In accordance with Order XLVII of Code of Civil Procedure review jurisdiction can be invoked only when there is an error apparent on the face of record or some new evidence has come to the knowledge of the petitioner which was not available to him even after exercise of due diligence. The review petition is not maintainable on the ground that the judgement is not to the liking of the petitioner. Once the judgement has been rendered it cannot be altered nor can any addition be made to it unless the grounds adduced are such as necessitate alteration in accordance with the statutory provisions made in Order XLVII of Code of Civil Procedure. The grounds which have been disposed of cannot be re-argued through the review petition. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Chandra Kanta and another v. Sheik Habib** AIR 1975 SC 1500 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 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 ineffectually covered ground or minor mistakes of inconsequential import, are obviously insufficient."

In view of the above discussion the R.A. has no merit and is accordingly rejected in circulation.

Dalrymple
(I.K. RASGOTRA)

MEMBER(A)

S. K. 171192

anand
(P.K. KARTHA)
VICE-CHAIRMAN(J)