

23

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No.11/2006  
MA No.91/2006  
OA No.2161/2004

New Delhi this the 18th day of January, 2006..

HON'BLE MR. SHANKER RAJU, MEMBER (J)

Shri Pappan Singh - Review Applicant  
-Versus-  
U.O.I. and others - Review Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

This RA is directed against an order passed in OA No.2161/2004 on 3.8.2005 dismissing the OA..

2. The review applicant has also filed MA-91/2006 for condonation of delay in filing the R.A. I have perused the said MA and for the reasons stated in it, MA 91/2006 is allowed.
3. I have also perused the grounds taken in the Review Application, but I find no error apparent on the face of record. By this Review Application, applicant in Review Application is only trying to re-argue the whole matter as if it is an appeal. The ambit of review under Section 22 (3) (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 as well as Order XLVII, Rules (1) and (2) is limited. The Apex Court in *Union of India v. Tarit Ranjan Das*, 2004 SCC (L&S) 160 observed as under:

“13. The Tribunal passed the impugned order by reviewing the earlier order. A bare reading of the two orders shows that the order in review application was in complete variation and disregard of the earlier order and the strong as well as sound reasons contained therein whereby the original application was rejected. The scope for review is rather limited and it is not permissible for the forum hearing the review application to act as an appellate authority in respect of the original order by a fresh order



and rehearing of the matter to facilitate a change of opinion on merits. The Tribunal seems to have transgressed its jurisdiction in dealing with the review petition as if it was hearing an original application. This aspect has also not been noticed by the High Court."

- 4 Having regard to the above, RA is dismissed, in circulation.

S. Raju  
(Shanker Raju)  
Member(J)

/w/