IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR.

R.A No.1/2001 Date of order: 7/2/2001

1. Union of India, through Secretary to the Govt, Deptt. of Telecommunications, Sanchar Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Chief General Manager, Teecom, Rajasthan Circle, Jaipur.
3. General Manager, Telecom Deptt, Kota.
4. JTO Incharge, CTO Office, Kota.

...Review petitioners.

Vs.

Sh.Madhusudan Gupta, S/o Sh.Brij Mohan Gupta, R/o Gurudwara Road, Kota Jn, Working as Telegraphist, CTO, Kota.

...Respondent.

Mr.Mr.M.Rafiq - Counsel for review petitioners.

PER HON'BLE MR.S.K.AGARWAL, JUDICIAL MEMBER.

This review application has been filed to recall/review the order of this Tribunal dated 16.8.2000passed in O.A No.412/9, Madhusudan Gupta Vs. UOI & Ors alongwith M.A No.22/2001 for condonation of delay in filing the Review Application.

2. The M.A for condonation of delay is allowed and the delay is condoned.

3. Vide order dated 16.8.2000 this Tribunal allowed the O.A with the direction to the respondents to pay the applicant the pay and allowances of the post of Sr.TOA(T) w.e.f. 9.5.95 till he is working on the post and to fix his pay in the pay scale applicable for Sr.TOA (T) within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the applicant shall not be entitled to any interest on the amount so payable to him with no order as to costs.

4. We have perused the averments made in this Review application and also perused the order deliverd by this Tribunal dated 16.8.2000 in O.A No.412/97.

5. The main contention of the learned counsel for the review petitioner in this Review Application is to hear the O.A afresh on merits and to re-examine the validity of the order Annx.A1 and the order of DGP&T, New Delhi dated 25.6.1965.

6. Section 22(3) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 confers on Administrative Tribunal discharging the functions under the Act, the same powers as are vested in a Civil Court under the Code of Civil Procedure while trying a suit in respect inter alia of reviewing its decisions.

7. A Civil Court's power to review its own decision under the Code of Civil Procedure is contained in Order 47 Rule 1, Order 47. Rule 1

provides as follows:

"Order 47 Rule 1; Application for review of judgment:

(1)Any person considering himself aggrieved;

(a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred.

(b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or

(c) by a decision on reference from a Court of small causes and who, from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due deligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produeced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the court which passed the decree or made the order."

8. On the basis of the above proposition of law, it is clear that power of the review available to the Administrative Tribunal is similar to power given to civil court under Order 47 Rule 1 of Civil Procedure Code, therefore, any person who consider himself aggrieved by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed but from which no appeal has been preferred, can apply for review under Order 47 Rule 1(a) on the ground that there is an error apparent on the face of the record or from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due deligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree or order was passed but it has now come to his knowledge.

9. What the petitioner is claiming through this review petition is that this Tribunal should reappreciate the facts and material on record. This is beyond the purview of this Tribunal while exercising the powers of the review conferred upon it under the law. It has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Smt.Meera Bhanja Vs. Nirmal Kumari, AIR 1995 SC 455 that reappreciating facts/law amounts to overtstepping the jurisdiction conferred upon the Courts/Tribunal while reviewing its own decisions. In the present petition also the petitioner is trying to claim reappreciation of the facts and material on record which is decidedly beyond the power of review conferred upon the Tribunal and as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

10. It has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent judgment Ajit Kumar Rath Vs. State of Orissa & Ors, JT 1999(8) SC 578 that a review cannot be claimed or asked for merely for a fresh hearing or arguments or correction of an erroneous view taken earlier, that is to say, the power of review can be exercised only for correction of a

patent error of law or fact which stares in the face without any elaborate argument being needed for establishing it. It may be pointed out that the expression 'any other sufficient reason' used in Order 47 Rule 1 means a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule.

11. We have given anxious consideration to the contention raised by the learned counsel for the applicant in the Review application and also perused the order dated 16.8.2000 passed in O.A No.412/97 and the whole case file thorougly. We have also given anxious consideration to para 6 of our order and we see that detailed reasons are also given why it was equitable to give such direction. and we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record and no new important fact or evidence has come into the notice of this Tribunal on the basis of which the order passed by the Tribunal can be reviewed.

12. In view of above and the facts and circumstances of this case, we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record to review the impugned order and therefore, there is no basis to review the above order.

13. We, therefore, dismiss the review application having no merits.

(N.P.Nawani)
Member (A).

(S.K.Agarwal)
Member (J).