

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**R.A. No.05/2018 In
O.A. No.679/2015**

New Delhi this the 4th day of January, 2018

**HON'BLE MR. V. AJAY KUMAR, MEMBER (J)
HON'BLE MS. NITA CHOWDHURY, MEMBER (A)**

Tara Singh (Rtd. SCD Grade I), Aged 64 years,
S/o Late Ram Singh
R/o Village Godalpur, Gali No.14,
P.O. and P.S. Azadpur, District Delhi.Review Applicant

Versus

1. The Govt. of NCT of Delhi
Through the Chief Secretary,
Delhi Secretariat, I.P. Estate,
New Delhi-110002.
2. The Labour Commissioner,
Govt. of NCT of Delhi,
Department of Labour,
5, Sham Nath Marg, Delhi-110054. ...Respondents

ORDER BY CIRCULATION

By Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)

The facts, in brief, are that while deciding the Original Application (OA) bearing No.679/2015, this Tribunal considered all the issues raised by the Review Applicant and disposed of the same on merits on 31.10.2017 (Annexure-RA-1). The operative part of the said order reads as under:-

“10. The core controversy involved in this case is whether applicant can claim promotion against a single post of SCD Special Grade from back date. No doubt, he was considered for the post of SCD Grade-I w.e.f. 21.08.2007 but was not recommended for Special Grade as there is only 1 post (5%) in this grade available in the Department and same was kept in the sealed cover for Shri Amar Singh Jatav being senior to Shri Tara Singh. Applicant retired from Government service on 31.12.2010 whereas Shri Amar Singh Jatav retired on 28.02.2011. We may further mention that as per para 4 of the

OM of DOP&T dated 15.02.2001, promotion to the Special Grade shall be by non-selection (seniority-cum-fitness) from Grade-I with 3 years regular service in Grade-I SCD. Hence applicant completed 3 years as Grade-I on 21.08.2010, i.e., much prior to retirement, but as Shri Amar Singh Jatav was senior so applicant is not entitled for any relief in this OA and cannot claim that the lone post of SCD Special Grade be given to him. Accordingly, the OA lacks merit and is dismissed. No costs".

2. Now the Review Applicant has filed the present RA bearing No.05/2018 for reviewing the indicated order, mainly on the ground that Tribunal has erred in not granting relief to him though he was eligible for the same. This cannot be a ground for reviewing the order. Thus review applicant cannot be permitted to re-agitate all the points again.

3. It is now well settled principle of law that the earlier order can only be reviewed if the case squarely falls within the legal ambit of review and not otherwise. Order 47 Rule 1 CPC read with Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 regulates the provisions of review of the orders. According to the said provision, a review will lie only when there is discovery of any new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by the review applicant seeking the review at the time when the order was passed **or made on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record.** It is now well settled principle of law that the scope for review is rather limited and it is not permissible for the forum hearing the review application to act as an Appellate Authority in respect of the original order by a fresh and re-hearing of the matter to facilitate a change of opinion on merits. The reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgments of the Hon'ble

Supreme Court in cases of ***Parson Devi and Others vs. Sumitri Devi and Others (1997) 8 SCC 715, Ajit Kumar Rath Vs. State of Orissa (1999) 9 SCC 596, Union of India Vs. Tarit Ranjan Das (2003) 11 SCC 658 and Gopal Singh Vs. State Cadre Forest Officers' Association & Others (2007) 9 SCC 369.***

4. An identical question came up to be decided by Hon'ble Apex Court in case ***State of West Bengal and Others Vs. Kamal Sengupta and Another (2008) 8 SCC 612.*** Having interpreted the scope of review and considering the catena of previous judgments mentioned therein, the following principles were culled out to review the orders:-

- “(i) The power of the Tribunal to review its order/decision under Section 22(3)(f) of the Act is akin/analogous to the power of a Civil Court under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC.
- (ii) The Tribunal can review its decision on either of the grounds enumerated in Order 47 Rule 1 and not otherwise.
- (iii) The expression "any other sufficient reason" appearing in Order 47 Rule 1 has to be interpreted in the light of other specified grounds.
- (iv) An error which is not self-evident and which can be discovered 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).
- (v) An erroneous order/decision cannot be corrected in the guise of exercise of power of review.
- (vi) A decision/order cannot be reviewed under Section 22(3)(f) on the basis of subsequent decision/judgment of a coordinate or larger bench of the Tribunal or of a superior Court.
- (vii) While considering an application for review, the Tribunal must confine its adjudication with reference to material which was available at the time of initial decision. The happening of some subsequent event or development cannot be taken note of for declaring the initial order/decision as vitiated by an error apparent.
- (viii) Mere discovery of new or important matter or evidence is not sufficient ground for review. The party seeking review has

also to show that such matter or evidence was not within its knowledge and even after the exercise of due diligence, the same could not be produced before the Court/Tribunal earlier”.

5. Meaning thereby, the original order can only be reviewed if case strictly falls within the domain of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC read with Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and not otherwise. In the instant RA, the review applicant has not pointed out any error apparent on the face of record warranting a review of the order dated 31.10.2017 (Annexure-RA-1). Moreover, the issues now sought to be urged, were subject matter of the OA and have already been adjudicated upon by the Tribunal.

6. In the light of the aforesaid reasons, as there is no apparent error on the face of record, so no ground is made out to entertain the present Review Application, which is accordingly dismissed.

(NITA CHOWDHURY)
MEMBER (A)

(V. AJAY KUMAR)
MEMBER (J)

Rachna