

38

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH,
NEW DELHI.

R.A. No. 315/94

IN

O.A. No. 313/92

New Delhi this the 23rd day of September, 94

HON'BLE MR. S. R. ADIGE, MEMBER (A)

Tilak Raj Bhatia

.....Applicant.

Versus

Union of India & othersRespondents.

ORDER (BY CIRCULATION)

In this application bearing No. 315/94 Shri Tilak Raj Bhatia has prayed for review of judgment dated 3.8.94 in O.A. No. 313/92 'Tilak Raj Bhatia Vs. UOI & others'.

2. In that O.A., the applicant had prayed for sanction of pension along with commuted value of pension, arrears and consequential benefits.
3. After hearing both sides at length and perusing the available materials on record, it had been held in the impugned judgment that the applicant was not entitled to the reliefs prayed for, for the reasons explained therein.
4. A perusal of the contents of the review petition makes it clear that none of the conditions laid down in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC are satisfied and under the guise of the review petition, the applicant is in fact appealing against the decision in the impugned judgment. In 'Chandra Kanta Vs. Sheik Habib' - AIR 1975 SC 1500, it has been held as follows:-

/r

39

"A review of a judgment is a serious step and reluctant resort to it is proper only where a glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility. A mere repetition through different counsel of old and overruled arguments, a second trip over ineffectually covered ground or minor mistake of inconsequential import are obviously insufficient."

5. In the light of what has been stated above, no good grounds have been made out to review the impugned judgment and under the circumstances this review petition is dismissed.

Anfolige
(S.R. ADIGE)
MEMBER (A)

/ug/