

35

Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi.

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. (DAO),  
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 appeared  
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

B

26

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.

/vv/

(B. K. Singh)  
Member (A)

22/4/96