CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

Review Application No. 30/2011
in
Original Application No. 114/2007

Date of Order: 16.09.2011

Nand Singh Chouhan S/o Late Shri Hari Singh Chouhan, aged about 44 years, r/o House No. 222, C/27, Baniya Wali Gali, Avadhpur, Johnsganj, Amjer, presently working as CBR, Grade-II, Shop No.28, under Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer (Carriage), North Western Railway, Ajmer Division, Ajmer – 305 001 (Raj.).

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri C.B. Sharma)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through General Manager, North Western Railway Zone, North Western Railway, Jaipur – 302006.

2. Chief Works Manager, (Loco), North Western Railway, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.

3. Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer (Carriage), North Western Railway, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.

4. Works Manager, (Loco), North Western Railway, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.

5. Shri Deependra Sharma, Technician Grade-III Welder, Shop No. 28, Carriage, c/o Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer (Carriage), North Western Railway, Ajmer Division, Ajmer.

.....Respondents

O R D E R (By Circulation)

The present Review Application has been filed by the applicant, Nand Singh Chouhan, in the OA for reviewing/recalling

the order dated 12th August, 2011 passed in OA No. 114/2007 – Nand Singh Chouhan vs. Union of India and Ors.

2. We have perused the averments made and the ground taken in the Review Application, and are of the view that there is no merit in this Review Application in view of the limited scope provided under the law for reviewing the order.

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".

4. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we find no merit in this Review Application and the same is accordingly dismissed by circulation.

Anil Kumar

(ANIL KUMAR)
Admv. Member

K.S. Rathore

(JUSTICE K.S.RATHORE)
Judl. Member

Kumawat