CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH

R.A.NO.82 OF 2016
(In O.A.NO.2553 OF 2014)

New Delhi, this the 19th day of April, 2016

CORAM:
HON'BLE SHRI RAJ VIR SHARMA, JUDICIAL MEMBER
……

Rajendra,
s/o late Sh.Hans Raj,
aged 88 years,
Resident of Flat No.6436/B-39,
Vasant Kunj,
New Delhi 110070 …… Applicant

(In Person)

Vs.
Union of India represented by

1. Pay & Accounts Officer,
   Central Pension Accounting Office,
   Ministry of Finance, Govt. of India,
   Trikoot Complex,
   Bhikaji Cama Place,
   R.K.Puram,
   NewDelhi 110066

2. Pay & Accounts Officer,
   Ministry of Law & Justice,
   4th Floor, B.Wing, Janpath Bhawan,
   Janpath,
   New Delhi 110001

3. Department of Pension & Pensioners'Welfare,
   Lok Nayak Bhawan,
   A Wing, 3rd Floor,

Khan Market,
New Delhi 110003

4. President,
Income Tax Appellate Tribunal,
Pratishtha Bhawan,
4th Floor, 101 M.K.Road,
Mumbai 400020 ……. Respondents

ORDER
(By Circulation)

The review petitioner was applicant in OA No.2553 of 2014 which was dismissed by the Tribunal, as being devoid of merit, vide its order 15.2.2016. The present review application is filed by him under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987 read with Section 22(3)(f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, with the following prayer:

> "It is prayed that as the Hon'ble Single Member has raised new points for differing from (the from) four CAT judgments in comparable case, without giving opportunity to the applicant for making his submissions, the Hon'ble Single member may be pleased to recall its order dated 15.02.16 and give applicant opportunity."

2. Before proceeding to consider the above prayer of the applicant-review petitioner, I would like to refer to the following decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding the scope of review, and power of review exercisable by judicial forums, including the Tribunals established under the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

2.1 In **Ajit Kumar Rath v. State of Orissa and others,** (1999) 9 SCC 596, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held 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. Any other attempt, except an attempt to correct an apparent error, or an attempt not based on any ground set out in Order 47 of the Code of Civil Procedure, would amount to an abuse of the liberty given to the Tribunal under the Act to review its judgment.

2.2 In **Union of India v. Tarit Ranjan Das,** 2004 SCC (L&S) 160, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held 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 court in respect of the original order, by a fresh order and rehearing the matter to facilitate a change of opinion on merits.

2.3 In **State of West Bengal and others v. Kamal Sengupta and another,** (2008) 2 SCC (L&S) 735, the Hon'ble Apex Court has scanned its various earlier judgments and summarized the following principles:

> "35. The principles which can be culled out from the above-noted judgments are:
>
> (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 CPC.
> (ii) The Tribunal can review its decision on either of the grounds enumerated in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC.

(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."

2.4 The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in **Kamlesh Verma vs. Mayawati & others,** 2013(8) SCC 320, has laid down the following contours with regard to maintainability, or otherwise, of review petition:

"20. Thus, in view of the above, the following grounds of review are maintainable as stipulated by the statute:

20.1 When the review will be maintainable:

i) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him;

ii) Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record;

iii) Any other sufficient reason.
The words "any other sufficient reason" have been interpreted in Chhajju Ram v. Neki (AIR 1922 PC 122) and approved by this Court in Moran Mar

Basselios Catholicos v. Most Rev. Mar Poulose Athanasius (AIR 1954 SC 526) to mean "a reason sufficient on grounds at least analogous to those specified in the rule". The same principles have been reiterated in Union of India vs. Sandur Manganese & Iron Ores Ltd. (23013(8) SCC 337).

20.2 **When the review will not be maintainable:**

i) A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications.

ii) Minor mistakes of inconsequential import.

iii) Review proceedings cannot be equated with the original hearing of the case.

iv) Review is not maintainable unless the material error, manifest on the face of the order, undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice.

v) A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected but lies only for patent error.

vi) The mere possibility of two views on the subject cannot be a ground for review.

vii) The error apparent on the face of the record should not be an error which has to be fished out and searched.

viii) The appreciation of evidence on record is fully within the domain of the appellate court, it cannot be permitted to be advanced in the review petition.

ix) Review is not maintainable when the same relief sought at the time of arguing the main matter had been negatived."

3. Keeping the above enunciation of law in mind, let me consider the claim of the applicant-review petitioner and find out whether a case has been made out by him for allowing his prayer in the R.A.

4. The applicant-review petitioner, besides reiterating more or less the same contentions as raised by him in the O.A., Rejoinder Reply, and written note of arguments, has contended that the Single Member has taken into account certain new points for differing from the views taken by the Tribunal in the cases relied on by him, without giving him opportunity of making submissions thereon.

5. After going through the records and the order dated 15.2.2016, *ibid,* I have found that the points, which were considered by the Tribunal, arose from the pleadings, and the rival contentions of the parties. Therefore, there is no substance in the contention of the applicant that certain new points were taken into consideration by the Single Member for differing from the views taken by the Tribunal in the cases relied on by him in support of his claim. It is pertinent to mention here that although no counter reply was filed on behalf of the respondents, the Tribunal, taking into consideration the facts that the applicant was a senior citizen, and that the matter related to pension, took up the O.A. for hearing on 6.8.2015. After the hearing was concluded, the order was reserved on 6.8.2015. Thereafter, the Tribunal took up the matter under the heading "For Being Spoken To" on 27.8.2015, 15.9.2015, 1.10.2015, 27.10.2015, and 1.12.2015, and required the respondents to file counter reply. After the counter reply was filed on behalf of the respondents, the applicant was given opportunity to file his rejoinder reply. Accordingly, the applicant filed his rejoinder reply, and also a written note of arguments. Lastly, on 8.12.2015, the Tribunal took up the

matter under the heading "For Being Spoken To", and, after hearing Mr.R.Kapoor, the learned counsel appearing for the applicant, and Mr.Rajesh Katyal, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents, reserved the order. It is, thus, found that sufficient opportunity was given to the applicant to make his submissions on all aspects of the matter which were considered by the Tribunal while passing the order dated 15.2.2016, *ibid.*

6. After going through the review application, I find that the applicant-review petitioner has repeated his old arguments which have been overruled by the Tribunal, vide order dated 15.2.2016, *ibid.* A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected, but lies only for patent error. The appreciation of evidence on record, being fully within the domain of the appellate court, cannot be permitted to be advanced in the review petition. In a review petition, it is not open to the Tribunal to re-appreciate the evidence/materials and reach a different conclusion, even if that is possible. Conclusion arrived at on appreciation of evidence/materials and contentions of the parties, which were available on record, cannot be assailed in a review petition, unless it is shown that there is an error apparent on the face of the record or for some reason akin thereto. The review applicant has not shown any material error, manifest on the face of the order dated 15.2.2016, *ibid*, which undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice. If the applicant-petitioner is not satisfied with the order passed by this Tribunal, remedy lies elsewhere.

The scope of review is very limited. It is not permissible for the Tribunal to act as an appellate court. Therefore, the Review Application is dismissed at the stage of circulation itself.

(RAJ VIR SHARMA)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

AN