



**Central Administrative Tribunal  
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

**RA No.51/2021  
in  
O.A. No. 313/2021**

**This the 9<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021**

Through Video Conferencing

**Hon'ble Ms. Manjula Das, Chairman  
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Delhi Development Authority,  
Vikas Sadan, INA,  
New Delhi-110023.

...Review Applicant

(By Advocate: Ms. Sriparna Chatterjee)

**Versus**

Sushil Kumar Sharma,  
S/o Late Shri Babu Ram Sharma,  
R/o 205, Sukhdev Vihar,  
Ground Road (Rear Side),  
New Delhi-110 025.

...Review Respondent

(By Advocate : Shri Ajay Sharma)

**ORDER (ORAL)****Hon'ble Ms. Manjula Das, Chairman**

This Review Application is filed by the respondent in the OA with a prayer to review the order dated 18.06.2021 passed by this Tribunal in OA No. 313/2021. The issue therein was very simple and the order was passed after hearing both the parties.

2. Today, we heard Ms. Sriparna Chatterjee, learned counsel for Review Applicant and Shri Ajay Sharma, learned counsel for review respondent, at some length.

3. The scope of the power of review by Civil Courts has been further elaborated by various judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court which, in essence, lay down that by way of review neither the review applicant can reargue his case afresh, nor the Civil Court can become its own Appellate Authority. The scope of review is limited to situations where a new evidence has been discovered, which despite due diligence, was not within the knowledge of the applicant earlier or on



account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record. These principles have been reiterated in :-

(i) ***Union of India v. Tarit Ranjan Das***, (2004) SCC (L&S) 160

(ii) ***Ajit Kumar Rath v. State of Orissa and Others***, (1999) 9 SCC 596

(iii) ***State Of West Bengal & Ors vs Kamal Sengupta & Anr*** 2008 (9) SCALE 509

(iv) ***Gopal Singh Vs. State Cadre Forest Officers Association & Ors.*** 2007 9 SCC 369

4. Taking into account the aforesaid discussion, we find that the review applicant has not been able to establish any error apparent on the face of the record. The RA, therefore, is dismissed as devoid of merit.

**(Mohd. Jamshed)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Manjula Das)**  
**Chairman**

‘/rk/vb’