

Central Administrative Tribunal Lucknow Bench Lucknow

Review Application No. 50/09 in Original Application No.209/2009

This, the 4th day of December, 2009

**HON'BLE MS. SADHNA SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE DR. A.K. MISHRA, MEMBER (A)**

Laxmi Prasad Mishra aged about 61 years son of Sri Ram Sewak retired SPM, Bankatwa Balapur, P.O. Pure Shiv Dayal Ganj, District-Gonda.

.....Applicant

By Advocate: Sri R.S. Gupta and V. Laxmi

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary, Department of Post, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. SPOs, Gonda
3. Sri K.K. Maurya, SPOs, Gonda

Respondents.

By Advocate: None

ORDER (Under Circulation)

By Hon'ble Ms. Sadhna Srivastava, Member (J)

This Review Application has been filed seeking review of judgment and order dated 6.10.2009 passed in O.A. No. 209/2009 (Laxmi Prasad Mishra Vs. Union of India and others).


2. The applicant has filed this application alleging that the judgment in question is no judgment in the eye of law.
3. The scope and power of Tribunal to review its decision has been elaborately laid down by the Apex Court in the case of **State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamal Sengupta and another reported at (2008) 8 SCC 612** after taking into account almost the entire case law on the subject of review. It has been held that an error which is not self evident and which can be discovered only by a long process of reasoning, cannot be treated as an error apparent on the face of record justifying exercise of power under section 22 (3) (f) of AT Act. An erroneous decision cannot be corrected in the guise

of exercise of power of review. It has further been held that review can not partake the character of an appeal. The following observation has been made in para 22 of the judgment.


"The term "mistake or error apparent" by its very connotation signifies an error which is evident per se from the record of the case and does not require detailed examination, scrutiny and elucidation either of the facts or the legal position. If an error is not self-evident and detection thereof requires long debate and process of reasoning, it cannot be treated as an error apparent on the face of the record for the purpose of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC or Section 22 (3)(f) of the Act. To put it differently, an order or decision or judgment cannot be corrected merely because it is erroneous in law or on the ground that a different view could have been taken by the court/ tribunal on a point of fact, or law. In any case, while exercising the power of review, the court/tribunal concerned cannot sit in appeal over its judgment/decision."

4. Review is not the remedy for the applicant to correct an erroneous judgment. The Tribunal has no power to review its judgment if there is no error apparent on face of record.
5. We have gone through the review application. We do not find any mistake or error apparent on the face of record. Any error on the face of record must be such as to appear on the face without having to apply process of logic and arguments. Since the scope of review application is very limited, we do not see any error apparent in the judgment. Therefore, review application is dismissed without any order as to costs.


(Dr. A.K. Mishra)
Member (A)


(Sadhna Srivastava)
Member (J)

HLS/-


04-12-2009 