

14  
By Circulation

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**

**PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI.**

Review Application No. 63 of 2005.

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 2110 of 2004.

ALLAHABAD THIS THE 25th DAY OF APRIL 2005.

**Hon'ble Mr. D.R. Tiwari, Member (A)**

Shri Vijay Kumar Yadav  
R/o Rz-302/345, Siwpuri,  
Gali No.5, Sagarpur,  
New Delhi.

.....Applicant.

(By Advocate: Sri S.C. Luthra).

Versus.

1. Union of India

Through Ministry of Personnel, Public  
Grievances & Pension, (Dept. of Personnel &  
Trg.) North Block, New Delhi-110 001.

2. Chairman

Staff Selection Commission,  
Block No.12, CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road,  
New Delhi-110 003.

(By Advocate : Smt. Pramila Safaya)

**ORDER**

The instant Review Application has been filed  
against the judgment dated 3.2.2005 in the case of  
Vijay Kumar Yadav Vs, Union of India and others.

2: I have gone through the review application and  
I find there is no error apparent on the face of  
record. I get support for my view from the  
decision of Apex Court in A.I.R 1980 SC 2040  
wherein it has been held that review is not a  
routine procedure, material error manifest must be

*D.R.*

2.

on the face of earlier order. It is settled legal position that review is not an appeal in disguise.

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ajit K. Babu and others Vs. Union of India and others- 1998 (1) SLJ 85 (SC) has held that right of review is not a right of appeal where all questions decided are open to challenge.

4. Under the circumstances and the legal position explained above, the review fails on merit and is accordingly rejected.

*Dinesh*  
Member (A)

/Manish/