

**IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI**

R.A.No. 286/93 in OA No.1931/91 **DATE OF DECISION** 17.9.93.

SHRI KARMA VEER	Petitioner
In person	Advocate for the Petitioner(s)
Versus	
U.O.I., ICAR & Ors.	Respondent
SHRI SANJAY SUDHIR, PROXY COUNSEL FOR SHRI A.K. SIKRI,	Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

✓ **The Hon'ble Mr. N.V. Krishnan, Vice-Chairman (A)**
The Hon'ble Mr. B.S. Hegde, Member (J)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement ?
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal ?

O R D E R

The applicant has filed this Review Application seeking review of the judgement dated 19.3.1993 between Shri Karma Veer v/s Union of India, ICAR & Others. We have seen the review application and we are satisfied that the review application can be disposed of by circulation under Rule 17(iii) of the CAT (Procedure) Rules, 1987 and we proceed to do so.

Rule 1

~~12~~ 32

2. Under O. 47 of the CPC, a decision/judgement / order can be reviewed only if -

(i) it suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record;

(ii) new material or evidence is discovered which was not within the knowledge of the parties or could not be produced by that party at the time the judgement was made despite due diligence; or

(iii) for any sufficient reason construed to mean analogous reason.

3. A perusal of the Review Application makes it clear that none of the ingredients referred to above, have been made out to warrant a review of the afore-said judgement especially when the Original Application itself was dismissed on the plea of prematurity and an enquiry initiated against the applicant has not been completed.

4. The scope of the Review Application is very limited and the Review Application is maintainable only if there is an error apparent on the face of the record or some new evidence has come to notice which was not available even after exercise of due diligence or any other sufficient reason. The Review Application



cannot be utilised for re-arguing the case trans-
versing the same ground in Chandra Kanta v/s Sk.
Habib [AIR 1975 SC 1500] wherein the Supreme
Court held that once an order has been passed by
the court, review thereof must be subject to the
rules of the game and cannot be lightly entertained.
Review of a judgement is a serious step and reluctant
resort to it is proper only where a glaring omission
or patent mistake or grave error has crept in earlier
by judicial fallibility.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances, we
do not see any merit in the Review Application and
the same is rejected in circulation.


(B.S. Hegde)
Member (J)


(N.V. Krishnan)
Vice-Chairman (A)