

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH

RA No. 4/1995 in OA 394/1994 1992

New Delhi, this 17th day of January, 1995

Hon'ble Shri Justice S.C. Mathur, Chairman
Hon'ble Shri P.T.Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

Shri K.P. Dohare
B.2/63, Paschim Vihar
New Delhi-110 063

.. Applicant

VERSUS

Union of India, through
Secretary (TD) & DG(TD)
Ministry of Industry
Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi

.. Respondent

ORDER(by circulation)

Shri P.T. Thiruvengadam, Member(A)

This review application has been filed for
review of the order passed on 7.11.94 in OA 394/94, 1992.

✓
Corrected
vide order of
date passed on
P.A. date
23.8.95
which is
brought as
M.A.
Done
6.8.95

2. A review of a judgement is a serious step
and reluctant resort to it is proper only when a
glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave
error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility.
A mere repetition of old and overruled arguments, a
second trip over ineffectively covered ground or
minor mistake of inconsequential import are
obviously insufficient (AIR-1975-SC-1500 - Chandra
Kant & Anr. Vs. Sheik Habib).

3. Consideration of a review petition is also
circumscribed within the four corners of order 47,
rule 1 CPC wherein the jurisdiction to review has
been prescribed. In this case, the applicant has
not pointed out any mistake or error apparent on
the face of the record or has not brought out any

25

new or important matter or evidence or any analogous ground.

4. The order against which the review is now sought was given in the open court in the presence of the applicant who argued his case. Despite this, the review has been filed repeating the same arguments advanced by him. The review also contains certain new prayers which did not figure in the OA.

5. In the circumstances, the review application is dismissed. No costs.

P. J. Thi

(P.T.Thiruvengadam)
Member (A)

S. C. Mathur

(S.C. Mathur)
Chairman

/tvg/