

## Central Administrative Tribunal, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow

Review Application No. 332/00014/2014

in Original Application No.157/2006

This the 15 day of April, 2014**Hon'ble Sri Navneet Kumar, Member (J)****Hon'ble Ms. Jayati Chandra, Member (A)**

Mahesh Prasad aged about 45 yeas son of Sri Ram Lal SPM, Mishrikh Tirath S.O. Now P.A. Sitapur, r/o Lonianpurva near Baridh Behar Sitarpur.

Applicant

By Advocate: Sri R.S.Gupta

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary ,Department of Post, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. D.P.S. o/o CPMG, U.P., Lucknow.
3. SPOs, Sitapur

Respondents

By Advocate: Sri None

**ORDER (Under Circulation)****BY HON'BLE SRI NAVNEET KUMAR, MEMBER (J)**

The present Review Application is preferred by the applicant u/s 22(3)(f ) of AT Act, 1985 for reviewing the order dated 13.3.2014 passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No. 157 of 2006.

2. While deciding the said original application, the Tribunal dismissed the O.A. The learned counsel for the applicant field the present review petition indicating therein that the O.A. No. 156/2006 and O.A. No.157/2006 were similar issue, as such allowing one O.A. and dismissing another one is not justified.

3. The bare perusal of judgment of both the OAs clearly show that during the enquiry, the applicant of O.A. No. 157/2006 did not ask for any documents whereas the applicant of O.A. No.156/2006 asked for certain documents and out of those documents, only few were shown to the applicant whereas rest of them were not shown to the applicant, whereas applicant of O.A. No. 157/2006 has not made any request for providing him any documents as claimed by him and participated in the entire proceedings and there is no procedural lapses in conducting the enquiry.

As such, the Tribunal observed that there is no lapse or irregularity in the entire proceedings. Accordingly, O.A. was dismissed by the Tribunal. All these facts which are mentioned in the present review application were made in the O.A. itself and they were considered by the Tribunal.

4. Accordingly, by means of the present O.A., the applicants wants to re-open the entire matter a fresh.

5. The scope and power of Tribunal to review its decision has been elaborately laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamal Sengupta and another reported in (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 power of review. It is further held that review can not partake the character of an appeal. The Hon'ble Court observed as under:

**"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."**

6. 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.

7. As observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Meera Bhanja v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury reported in (1995) 1 SCC 170 ,**

the Hon'ble Apex Court has been pleased to decide the issue of review and has observed that review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly continued to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC and review petition is required to be entertained only on the ground of error apparent on the face of record.

8. As categorically pointed out by the Hon'ble Apex Court that who has decided the matter cannot re-apprise the entire issue afresh. Only the typographical error or the error apparent on record can be rectified in the Review Application. By means of the present Review Application the applicant tried to reopen the entire matter afresh.

9. In the case of **Satyanarayan Iaxminarayan Hegde and others, Vs. Mallikarjun Bhavanappa Tirumale** reported in AIR, 1960 SC 137, the Hon'ble Apex Court has been pleased to observe as under:-

**“ An error which has to be established by a long drawn process of reasoning on points where there may conceivably be two opinions can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record. As the above, discussion of the rival contentions show the alleged error in the present case is far from self evident and if it can be established, it has to be established, by lengthy and complicated arguments. We do not think such an error can be cured by a writ of certiorari according to the rule governing the powers of the superior court to issue such a writ. In our opinion the High Court was wrong in thinking that the alleged error in the judgment of the Bombay Revenue Tribunal Viz., that an order for possession should not be made unless a previous notice had been given was an error apparent on the face of the record so as to be capable of being corrected by a writ of certiorari.”**

10. In another case of **Parson Devi and Others Vs. Sumitri Devi and Others** reported in (1997) 8 SCC -715, the Hon'ble Apex Court has been pleased to observe as under:-

**“9. Under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power review under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be “reheard and corrected”. A review petition, it must be remembered has limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be “an appeal in disguise.”**

11. In the case of **Inder Chand Jain(Dead) Through Lrs, Vs. Motilal (Dead) Through Lrs.** Reported in (2009) 14 SCC 663 , the Hon'ble Apex Court has been pleased to observe as under:-

10. It is beyond any doubt or dispute that the review court does not sit in appeal over its own order. A rehearing of the matter is impermissible in law or pronounced, it should not be altered. It is also trite that exercise of inherent jurisdiction is not invoked for reviewing any order.

11. In **Lily Thomas Vs. Union of India**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held as under:-

"56. It follows , therefore, that the power of review can be exercised for correction of a mistake but not to substitute a view. Such powers can be exercised within the limits of the statute dealing with the exercise of power. The review cannot be treated like an appeal in disguise."

12. Perusing the application and ground of review , it is apparent that in the opinion of applicant, the judgment is erroneous and he is seeking its correction in the guise of exercise of power of review. In the case of **Gopal Singh Vs. State Cadre Forest Officers Association reported in 2007 (9) SCC 369**, it was held that the Tribunal could not travel out of its own jurisdiction to write a second order in the name of reviewing its own judgment and further that the Tribunal could not sit over its own judgment as an appellate authority.

13. We have gone through the review application. We do not find any mistake or error apparent on the face of record. The scope of review application is very limited.

14. Considering the facts of the case and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we do not find any ground to interfere with the present review petition. Review petition lacks merit and as such it deserves to be dismissed. Accordingly, Review Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

*J. Chandra*

(Jayati Chandra)  
Member (A)

*Navneet Kumar*  
(Navneet Kumar)  
Member (J)

HLS/-

*o/a  
Copy to Counsel  
Dated 15.4.14  
Encl  
16.4.14*