

Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

35

RA-82/96 in
OA-1948/92
New Delhi this the 23rd Day of April, 1996.
Hon'ble Sh. B.K. Singh, Member (A)

Shri K.S. Bhandari,
R/o I-611, Seva Nagar,
New Delhi.

Review Applicant

(through Sh. N. Ranganathaswamy, advocate)

versus

1. The Ministry of Defence,
Government of India,
Office of the 159 Amn. (DAD),
New Delhi.
2. CAO-A-5 (Pay),
Army Headquarters,
Ministry of Defence,
New Delhi.

Respondents

ORDER (IN CIRCULATION)
by Hon'ble Sh. B.K. Singh, M(A)

This review application has been filed
against the judgement/order in OA-1948/92 delivered
on 23.02.1996.

2. The scope of review is very limited. Review
of judgements can be allowed on three grounds, namely:
(a) discovery of new and important matter of evidence
which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not
within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be
produced by him at the time when the decree was passed
or order was made, or (b) some mistake or error apparent
on the face of the record, or (c) for any other
sufficient reason.

3. A review proceeding cannot be equated with
the original hearing of the case and the finality

BB

of the judgement delivered by the court will not be reconsidered except 'where a glaring omission or patent mistake or a grave error has crept in the order by judicial fallibility'. An error apparent on the face of the record stares one in the face. If the view adopted by the court in the original judgement is a possible view, having regard to what the record states, it is difficult to hold that there is an error apparent on the face of the record. This review application does not fall within the four corners of Order 47 Rule 1 and accordingly it is summarily rejected under Order 47 Rule 4(1) of the C. P. C.

(B. K. Singh)
Member (A)

22/4/96

/vv/