

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JAIPUR BENCH

JAIPUR, this the 30th day of August, 2011

Review Application No. 24/2011
(Original Application No.19/2007)

1. Union of India
through its General Manager,
North Western Railway,
Headquarters Office,
near Jawahar Circle,
Jagatpura, Jaipur

2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
North Western Railway,
Jaipur

.. Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri V.S.Gurjar)

Versus

Pyare Lal Saini
s/o Bhagwat Ram Saini
at present working as Assistant Loco Pilot,
Office of Chief Crew Controller,
Bandikui, Jaipur Division
r/o Railway Quarter No.1/118 C,
Railway Colony, Bandikui

.. Respondent

(By Advocate: -----)

Review Application No. 25/2011
(Original Application No.14/2007)

1. Union of India
through its General Manager,
North Western Railway,
Headquarters Office,
near Jawahar Circle,
Jagatpura, Jaipur
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
North Western Railway,
Jaipur

.. Applicants

(By Advocate: Shri V.S.Gurjar)

Versus

Mahesh Chand Meena
s/o Shri Ram Swaroop Meena,
at present working as Assistant Loco Pilot,
Office of Chief Crew Controller,
Bandikui, Jaipur Division
r/o Railway Quarter No.279-B ,
Railway Colony, Bandikui

.. Respondent

(By Advocate: -----)

ORDER (By Circulation)

The present Review Applications have been filed by the official respondents in the OAs for reviewing/recalling the common order dated 13th July, 2011 passed in OA No. 14/2007, Mahesh Chand vs. Union of India & ors. and OA No.19/2007, Pyare Lal vs. Union of India and ors.

2. We have perused the grounds and averments made in the Review Applications. We are of the view that there is no merit in these Review Applications as the grounds raised and



averments made in the Review Applications are beyond the scope of review.

3. The law on this point is already settled and the Hon'ble Apex Court has categorically held that the matter cannot be heard on merit in the guise of power of review and further if the order or decision is wrong, the same cannot be corrected in the guise of power of review. What is the scope of Review Petition and under what circumstance such power can be exercised was considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Ajit Kumar Rath Vs. State of Orissa, (1999) 9 SCC 596 wherein the Apex Court has held as under:

"The power of the Tribunal to review its judgment is the same as has been given to court under Section 114 or under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. The power is not absolute and is hedged in by the restrictions indicated in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. The power can be exercised on the application of a person on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made. The power can also be exercised on account of some mistake of fact or error apparent on the face of record or for any other sufficient reason. 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 fact without any elaborate argument being needed for establishing it. It may be pointed out that the expression 'any other sufficient reason' used in Order XL VII Rule 1 CPC means a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule".



In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court,
we find no merit in above Review Applications.

4. Accordingly, both the Review Applications are dismissed
by circulation. 

(ANIL KUMAR)
Admv. Member

(JUSTICE K.S.RATHORE)
Judl. Member

R/

copy given vide
no 1347
30/8/11
y