

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH
NEW DELHI.

RA 207/97 in OA 1793/92

(11)

New Delhi this the 26 th day of September, 1997

Hon'ble Shri S.R. Adige, Vice Chairman (A)
Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J)

Dr. Vandita Bansal
Central Government Health Scheme,
Meerut
W/O Dr. U.C. Bansal
R/O 43, Sector 37,
NOIDA

.. Applicant

Vs.

Union of India through

1. The Secretary (FY-1)
Department of Defence Production
Ministry of Defence, Sena Bhawan,
New Delhi-11
2. Director General,
Ordnance Factory Service
Ordnance Factory Board
10-A Auckland Road,
Calcutta-700001

.. Respondents

ORDER (By Circulation)

(Hon'ble Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan, Member (J))

We have carefully considered the grounds taken in the Review Application praying for review of the order dated 16.7.97 and to hear the applicant before allowing the OA with costs of the review petition.

2. The impugned order dated 16.7.97 is a reasoned one given after perusing the pleadings, as none had appeared on behalf of the applicant when the case was called out. None had appeared for the respondents either. The applicant has sought to re-argue the case in the review application. In the garb of the review petition, the applicant actually seeks to appeal against our judgment /order for which review application does not lie. It is settled position (See Chandra Kanta V. Sheikh Habib (1975 SC 1500) that "a review of a judgment is


18/

12

a serious step and reluctant resort to it is proper only where a glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave mistake has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility."

3. On perusal of the Review application we do not find that there is any error apparent on the face of the record or other sufficient grounds as provided under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC under which alone a review of a decision/order/judgment of the Tribunal is permissible. The applicant has contended that the respondents have tried to mislead the Court which ^{is incorrect} does not show that there is any error apparent on the face of the record. On the merits of the case, we find no good grounds to allow the review application to enable the applicant to be heard again on the same grounds which have already been considered in the impugned judgment.

4. In the facts and circumstances mentioned above, we are of the view that neither any error apparent on the face of the record nor new facts have been brought to our notice calling for review of the impugned order dated 16.7.97. Review Application is, therefore, rejected.


(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan)
Member (J)


(S.R. Adige)
Vice Chairman (A)